LXV

LIBRARY
DEINIOLS
I 53/15

Cancelled from
Gladstone's Library
23 NOV 2021

W. E. Gladstone

GLADSTONE'S
LIBRARY

St. Deiniol's Library
Hawarden, Clwyd
Founded by
The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone

TYPICAL ENGLISH CHURCHMEN

FROM PARKER TO MAURICE.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/typicalenglishch0000will

The Church Historical Society.

President: THE RIGHT REVEREND J. WORDSWORTH, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Chairman: THE REVEREND W. E. COLLINS,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON.

ST. DEINIOLS
WARDEN
LIBRARY

LXV

TYPICAL ENGLISH CHURCHMEN

FROM PARKER TO MAURICE.

A Series of Lectures

EDITED BY

WILLIAM EDWARD COLLINS, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AT
KING'S COLLEGE LONDON;
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF ST ALBANS.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.;
43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.
NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1902.

OXFORD
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	vii
I.	MATTHEW PARKER *By the Rev. Henry Gee, D.D.*	3
II.	RICHARD HOOKER *By the Rev. A. J. Mason, D.D.*	25
III.	WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH *By the Rev. Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., D.C.L.*	37
IV.	JAMES USHER *By the Rev. E. W. Watson, M.A.*	59
V.	JOHN BRAMHALL *By the Rev. W. E. Collins, M.A.*	81
VI.	JEREMY TAYLOR *By the Rev. H. Hensley Henson, B.D.*	123
VII.	GILBERT BURNET *By H. W. C. Davis, M.A.*	149
VIII.	JOSEPH BUTLER *By the Rev. Henry Wace, D.D.*	195
IX.	WILLIAM WARBURTON *By the Rev. J. Neville Figgis, M.A.*	215
X.	CHARLES SIMEON *By the Rev. C. H. Simpkinson, M.A.*	257
XI.	HENRY PHILLPOTTS *By the Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, D.D.*	299
XII.	FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE *By the Rev. W. E. Collins, M.A.*	327
	INDEX	361

INTRODUCTION

The lectures which are contained in this volume were delivered during the spring and early summer of last year, first at St Margaret's Westminster, and subsequently in the Abbey Church of St Albans. It is proposed by the Committee of the Church Historical Society that they should be followed by other sets of lectures, presenting in the aggregate a series of biographies of Typical English Churchmen from the earliest times to the present day.

According to the scheme of the present course, each lecturer was to be left entire freedom in dealing with his subject, the only stipulation being that the point of view should be strictly historical. Thus it will be found that differences abound, both in the method of treatment and in the standpoint of the writers. The lectures vary considerably in length; some are more general in plan, whilst some embody the results of no small amount of minute research; some are freely annotated, whilst others are almost or entirely without notes. Again, no attempt has been made to secure uniformity of language or to smooth away differences of opinion: each lecture records its author's own convictions and bears the impress of his personal equation; and if there be an unity underlying the diversity of standpoint and of outlook, as we have no doubt whatever that there is, and that it will so appear to any who study the volume as a whole, it is the unity which springs from our common life, not simply that which comes from the adoption of a common programme.

Again, the choice of subjects for the particular lectures may perhaps be considered open to criticism. It may be contended that the persons chosen for treatment are not in all cases conspicuous examples of saintliness. It may be urged that

the seventeenth century, prolific as it was in great men, is unduly represented. A series of Typical English Churchmen which omits Andrewes and Laud, Berkeley and Wesley and Whitefield, Arnold and the leaders of the Oxford Movement, not to mention others who flourished during the period which it covers, can hardly lay claim to anything approaching logical completeness. And even so, several names might easily be suggested as alternatives to one or other of those which have been included. But to all this an adequate answer may, I believe, be given. The aim of these lectures was not primarily to set forth patterns of the Christian life for imitation, but to supply guidance, by the study of the past, towards the realization of the ideal which God has set before us as English Churchmen; and consequently the subjects for the lectures were not chosen as conspicuous examples of holiness, but as notable types of English Churchmanship. The seventeenth century was such an age of ecclesiastical giants that on this ground alone it might fairly claim a larger representation than, for example, the eighteenth; and more especially is this the case in view of the fact that the age of Bramhall and Usher and Taylor, like that of Theodore and Benedict Biscop and Wilfrid, may fairly claim to be one of the great formative periods in the history of the English Church. Some who might well claim a place as Typical English Churchmen have been omitted because excellent short biographies of them are already in existence; and others because, valuable as their message and example have been for later days, their place in contemporary history was hardly such as to lend itself to treatment in this form. And whilst it is true that alternative names might easily be suggested instead of several which are here included, it must be borne in mind that no selection can do more than represent the views, and the reading, of the person or persons by whom it has been made. If some well-known names be absent, it must not be assumed that they were overlooked, or set aside without careful consideration; and for the rest, it is at least a fact worthy of notice, and a matter of no little satisfaction to those who were responsible for the selection, that the individual lecturers have

seen no reason to depreciate their subjects, but rather have found them both more interesting and more attractive as the result of careful study. This is a fact which the reader can test, in a measure, for himself.

I pass on to speak of our plan as a whole, in its larger aspects. The object which we have set before ourselves is to present and pourtray, as faithfully and impartially as we can, the life and work of a series of Typical English Churchmen. We do so with the assured conviction that, if this plan can be carried out with even a measure of fidelity, it will appear that a real unity of thought and character, and that of a very decided kind, underlies the manifold differences of temperament and opinion and circumstance which the pourtrayal will reveal. We believe, in fact, that just as there is a type of character, manifold yet one, which can truly be termed English, so also is there a type of churchmanship corresponding with it, which can truly be termed Anglican. We believe, further, that this type may be traced throughout the history of the English Church: that, in fact, it was developed in and through the history of the English Church. It is no creation of the English Reformation, although no doubt it was markedly intensified then, just as it would have been in part obliterated or obscured had the tumults of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ended in a victory either for Rome or for Geneva[1]. It is to be traced, in its main features, both before and after that period: the history of the English Church is as truly one as that of the English people, and the type of character evolved by the one is as well marked, generally speaking, as that evolved by the other. It is not of course a perfect type, perhaps very far from it. It has its strong points, and it has "the defects of its qualities." But at

[1] This is no mere assumption or surmise, but a statement which may easily be tested by reference to a parallel case. No competent student can doubt that the terms "the Gallican Church" or "the Spanish Churches," have little by little been evacuated of all their ancient meaning as the result of a process which is the direct opposite to our Reformation, so far as this latter affected our relations with the papacy. Our own day has seen a revival of the true Gallican spirit, the ultimate effects of which are still to be realized.

any rate (unless indeed we are wrong in thinking that it exists at all) it is there. We may use and develop it, or misuse and pervert it. We may strengthen it where it is weak, or we may dissipate the strength that it has. But we cannot get away from it except by mutilating ourselves in the most terrible of all ways, by abjuring our own history: by renouncing the heritage which comes to us from the past, and thus depriving ourselves of the promise of the future. And not only ourselves: for the character which is impressed upon us and the type into which we have been moulded carries with it a message. That which we have as a heritage is likewise that which the world craves at our hands: not indeed the only thing which the world needs, but yet a thing which it assuredly cannot be deprived of without grievous loss.

The type is there, and we are delivering our message, whether we are conscious of it or not; but it is obviously desirable that we should recognize it, that we should be conscious workers and not merely unconscious. History shows plainly that those nations and churches which have been most conscious of a divine calling and message have always been those which have most influenced the world: and it is the distinguishing glory of the Israel of God that it should join in fellowship with Him in the fulfilment of His purposes. But above all, perhaps, is it necessary for us of the English Church at the present day to realize our true character and our calling, since at the present day the tendency is largely to depreciate what is national and "particular" in favour of what is more general. That this should be so is not altogether to be wondered at, in view of the lamentable fact that opinion amongst us so often moves by way of reaction. There was a time when English theologians (and none more than the great theologians of the formative period of the seventeenth century) were quick to realize and proud to proclaim the place of the English Church in Christendom: standing as it does for a church order reformed and a faith purified on the old lines, under the guidance of the ancient and primitive fathers of the Catholic Church. Protestants like Grotius, Comenius, Jablonski, and Grundtvig, Roman

Catholics like De Courayer, De Maistre, and Montalembert have borne witness to her unique place in Western Christendom, standing as she does between them both, with a hand outstretched towards either. It has been reserved for some in our own day to feel ashamed of a large section of our history, to ignore as far as possible God's dealings with us during some three and a half centuries, to slur over all that is distinctive of ourselves, or at any rate to assume, in the supposed interests of a spurious Catholicism, that it is less sacred and less significant than anything which is common to ourselves and to our brethren of the Roman Communion. Surely no mistake could be greater. To ignore or overlook or minimize national characteristics is to do despite to that "tendency to vary" in which biologists have taught us to discern the root and the seal of all progress. To regard nothing as vital which is not also generally diffused is to stunt and dwarf all our ideals, and to evacuate the word "Catholic" of all its true meaning. We still have to learn, or have to learn afresh, that the idea of the Universal Church, as realized in the earliest days and developed in Holy Scripture by St Paul and others, does not absorb or nullify that of the local Church, but rather finds its proper complement in it. The latter would be merely nugatory without the former; but none the less the majesty and the fullness of the former finds its expression in the latter. We need to be taught again, as Bramhall will teach us, that the life of the Catholic Church is not inconsistent with, but is realized in, the free life of "Particular or National Churches." We need to be reminded again, as Frederick Denison Maurice will remind us, that so far from it being true that "a national society and a universal society are in their natures contradictory and incompatible," the fact is that "they have been only made so by certain notions which interfere with the universality of the spiritual body as well as the distinctness of the national body." And if we ask for an illustration of this to make us more sure, we may find it in that great religious organization which ignores nationality and professes to be above it: the Roman Curia, which, although it now disavows and disowns its own fatherland, has been

Italian and nothing else for a longer period than is covered by the subject-matter of this volume [1].

In holding that English Christendom has a real message for Christendom at large, and that there is a true Anglican type and an Anglican spirit, we are saying no more than is recognized on all hands in respect of other races. Nobody doubts, for instance, that there is what may properly be described as a Greek Christendom, with characteristics which stand out clearly, amidst much that is formal and stagnant, to this day; or that the Church at large is the richer for the distinctive impress of the Greek spirit both in theology and in church life. In like manner it cannot be questioned that there is a distinctively Latin spirit, which has stimulated organization and discipline, and has had an influence in effect even more far-reaching than that of the Greek spirit. Other types might easily be mentioned too, a Syrian or an Alexandrian, a Teutonic or a Swiss. But no one of them can even compare in importance with the two already spoken of, for however great their prevalence and however vital their influence at particular periods, in the third century or the sixteenth, no one of them can claim to have been developed and elaborated in a continuous history as these two have, or to have become ingrained in the same degree into the very life of the peoples concerned. The English type, however, may fairly claim to be on a level in importance even with these. If it is not so ancient, it has an even greater vitality at the present day; if it has not yet so wide a field, we shall hardly be mistaken in saying that its influence is really at once deeper and more far-reaching. If Greek Christianity gave to the world a veritable, because a God-centred, theology, and a noble reverence for the many-sidedness of God's truth; if Latin Christianity, with a theology which erred in that it was so largely man-centred and concerned itself too exclu-

[1] This has been acutely observed and noted by a Roman Catholic writer, the Rev. E. L. Taunton, *Cardinal Wolsey* p. 142 *n.*: "Although the principle of Nationality is vehemently decried as being opposed to the Catholicity of the Church, it can hardly be denied that never has a more striking example of that principle been shown to the world than at Rome for the last three hundred years or more."

sively with the problems of man's nature and man's destiny, nevertheless developed the sense of God's law and order and of individual responsibility[1], English Christianity has a message and a dower hardly less important than these. And the nature of this message and this dower is to be discerned, more perhaps than anywhere else, in the characteristic type of English churchmanship.

What then is this characteristic type? To answer the question in express terms would be very difficult and not very profitable. It is far more important that we should be imbued with it and recognize it in ourselves, and that it should bear fruit in action, than that we should be able to crystallize it out, so to speak, and define it in words. Our object, however, is not so much to answer the question at all as to present materials by means of which it may be answered, in the first of these two ways. Even this can only be done in a measure. To do it completely, it would be necessary to recapitulate the history of the English Church, to indicate its distinguishing features, and to investigate the causes out of which they spring. The plan that we have adopted is at once a less ambitious and a more practical one: to present the salient features of this type in the lives of characteristic English Churchmen of various periods.

The lives are allowed, as far as possible, to speak for themselves: so alone can they set before us the Anglican type and the Anglican spirit in their true proportions. But there are certain features in that type which stand out so clearly that it may not be presumptuous to attempt to indicate them in outline. Amongst such features, we believe, will be found the following, or such as these:

1. The English type is eminently practical. The great English Churchmen of all ages have been those who, whether they approved of them or fought against them, were most in touch with the conditions of their own day. They have been ready to start from facts, not from theories, and to

[1] To those who are really familiar with the Middle Ages, there is something ridiculous in the oft-repeated statement that the sense of individual responsibility was first developed at the Reformation.

realize that, however unpleasing those facts may be, they must be recognized and accepted. They have seen that to cut themselves adrift from the facts would be to renounce their heritage and to relinquish all that God's good providence had bestowed as a starting-point in the present, and as material for the future. In this has lain at once their strength and their weakness: their strength, in that, with an Englishman's disregard for the completeness of a logical system, they have discerned and made for that which was practically the wisest goal; their weakness, in that to solve difficulties by "rule of thumb" has often proved to be a way of creating more serious difficulties in the future.

2. It embodies a genuine love of liberty. Whilst it holds fast to that which is its own birthright, and will not treat those who do not share in that birthright as though they did, it shrinks from denouncing them or even passing judgement upon them. Without being notably more tolerant than other types, it lays even more stress upon the rights of the individual than upon the detection and punishment of evildoing. Without losing sight of or underrating the importance of the society, it is more ready than other types to give free play to individual activities, and to allow a large scope for individual genius. And here too it has the "defects of its qualities." For liberty is apt to degenerate into licence, and the free play of individual forces may easily become something not unlike anarchy.

3. Fortunately however, it is on the whole eminently sane and reasonable. Whatever other gift of the Spirit may be lacking, it is not that of a "sound mind."[1] A distinguishing feature of the history of the English Church in all ages is the way in which she has preserved her dignity and honour. There have indeed been periods of affliction and distress; but it may safely be said that no other Church in Christendom has had a history, regarded as a whole, of such unbroken prosperity. Here again it may be said that the "sound mind" has occasionally been debased by worldly wisdom, and that, at some periods at least, the Church has secured a worldly

[1] Πνεῦμα σωφρονισμοῦ (2 Tim. i. 7).

prosperity, because her leaders have been content to throw in their lot with the world. But, not to speak of the fact that such a policy defeats itself in the long run, and has, whenever it has been adopted, ended in the greatest measure of degradation and opprobrium that our Church has ever known, it may safely be claimed that this has not usually been the case. If the English Church has held an enduring place in the love and reverence of Englishmen, it is because they have realized that she is truly their own Church. Speaking generally, we have been singularly free from clericalism. Speaking generally, the great strength of the English Church has lain in the fact that her chief representatives have distinguished themselves by their reasonableness: by their readiness to discern the signs of the times, and to regulate their action, not alone by a traditional code of rules, however venerable, but by those great principles of conduct which are common to themselves and to all other men.

4. And lastly, the English type is essentially a learned type. The appeal of the English Church has at all times been to great fundamental principles, and to those principles as continually restudied and tested by an appeal to the facts of history. Nor is this only a modern characteristic; and if the English Church of to-day may aspire to be the Church of the New Learning, as we have been taught by Bishop Creighton, the beloved first President of the Church Historical Society, that fact may truly be regarded as the outcome and the fruit of all the earlier history of that Church, from the days of Theodore and Benedict Biscop onwards.

In conclusion, I have to express my regret for the fact that the publication of this volume has been so long delayed. A severe illness during the summer and autumn of last year made the preparation of it impossible at an earlier date; and it is in part owing to the same cause that this Introduction is being written in the West Indies. The hearty thanks of the Committee of the Church Historical Society, and my own in particular, are due to the Dean of St Albans; to Canon Henson (to whom the idea of this series was largely

due, and who bore a very large share in the making of the arrangements); to the other lecturers who have contributed to the volume; and to Miss Mary Sterland, who has not only helped largely in the preparation of the Index, but also (when Mr Figgis was unable to do so through illness) undertook the great labour of finding and verifying the whole of the quotations in the lecture on Warburton.

W. E. Collins,
Chairman of the Church Historical Society.

Codrington College, Barbados,
Shrove Tuesday, 1902.

I

MATTHEW PARKER

1504–1575

BY

HENRY GEE, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF BISHOP'S COLLEGE RIPON

MATTHEW PARKER

SURELY no young woman of twenty-five was ever called to so depressing a task as that which lay before the Princess Elizabeth when the news came to her that the Queen was dead. Perhaps nothing describes more forcibly the gloom of the situation than a document drawn up within a few weeks of that November morning by one who had been a Privy Councillor in King Edward's time. In a summary of what he calls "the distresses of the commonwealth," he depicts the position in these words: "The Queen poor. The realm exhausted. The nobility poor and decayed. Want of good captains and soldiers. The people out of order. Justice not executed. All things dear. Excess in meat, drink, and apparel. Division among ourselves. Wars with France and Scotland. The French king bestriding the realm, having one foot in Calais and the other in Scotland. Steadfast enmity, but no steadfast friendship abroad"[1].

[1] This interesting document (S. P. Dom. Elizabeth, i. 66) was probably written by Armigail Waad, a Privy Councillor in the reign of Edward VI. It is one of three surviving state papers drawn up, probably at Cecil's request, in December, 1558, before the meeting of Parliament. The other two are the celebrated "Device for alteration of Religion" (Cotton MS. Julius F. vi. 161) which was perhaps the work of Sir Thomas Smith, and the "Divers points of Religion" by Gooderick the lawyer (S. P. Dom. Elizabeth, i. 68). Gooderick's paper is described by Dr Dixon, *History of the Church of England* v. 25. I have examined the character and history of the "Device" in a lecture on *The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments*, 1901. The connexion of these three documents does not appear to have been noticed. There can be little doubt that they formed answers to questions propounded by Cecil or by the Privy Council in view of the work of Elizabeth's first Parliament.

Such were the problems for the young Queen to face. Not the least difficulty was that which is hinted at in the ominous sentence "Division among ourselves," or in other words, the religious question which was certain to cause strife and dissension at no distant date. For consider the position. By the circumstances of her birth and education, Elizabeth was sincerely attached to that new order of things which we sum up in the term "Reformation." But at her accession she found the Roman jurisdiction restored in England, the clergy as a whole opposed to change, and the bishops in possession of the Sees favourable to the old régime[1]. Furthermore, numbers of English people who had taken refuge on the Continent during the dark days of persecution were eager and anxious to return, whilst in addition to these, many Dutch and Flemish Protestants hailed the accession of Mary's sister as an opportunity for seeking in England an asylum from religious persecution abroad. These people, whether English or alien, represented every form of Protestantism[2].

Whatever doubts there may have been in those early days as to the future of England and the policy of the new Queen, no one at home or on the Continent really doubted that Elizabeth would alter the existing conditions of religion; and, with so many elements of dissension, religious division, of which Christendom was weary, would certainly manifest itself within the country, to say nothing of a possible combination of foreign powers from without. Therefore, the same writer whom I have already quoted goes on to say concerning change in religion: "This case is to be warily handled, for it requireth great cunning and circumspection both to reform religion and to make unity between the subjects being at square for the respect thereof, and as I pray God to grant us concord, both in the agreement upon the cause and state of religion, and among ourselves for the account of Catholic and Protestant, so would I wish that you would proceed to the reformation having respect to quiet at home, the affairs you have in hand with foreign princes, the greatness of the Pope,

[1] For the attitude of the clergy see Gee, *Elizabethan Clergy* cap. I.

[2] Cf. Dixon, v. 16, 34.

and how dangerous it is to make alteration in religion, specially in the beginning of a prince's reign."

"This case is to be warily handled." It was good advice, and this counsel of wise and cautious reformation was carried out during the early years of Queen Elizabeth, under the great statesman Sir William Cecil, to whom the paper was addressed. But in its execution he was aided, in no small degree, by the prudent and good Archbishop who was his life-long friend and confidant. Parker was behind the settlement of religion in the Queen's early years, counselling, suggesting, and in all probability controlling and guiding even when he is least visible upon the written page of history. Accordingly, when Strype came to write his life of the Archbishop after an interval of 150 years, he did not overestimate Parker's work in entitling his book: "The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Elizabeth, under whose primacy and influence the Reformation of Religion was happily effected, and the Church of England restored and established upon the principles whereon it stands to this day."

I

Let me summarize, then, the story of the Elizabethan settlement of religion in which Parker was so real an influence, and which must, at any rate, be presented as the background of the Archbishop's life. Elizabeth's first concern was to gather round her a Privy Council composed of men well-qualified, in most instances, to direct affairs, and committees of council were formed to deal with pressing matters of state. Under the guidance of one of these, the first Parliament of the new reign was called. It was one of the most memorable of English Parliaments, though it sat for little more than three months. In the teeth of strenuous opposition, on the part of the bishops and others, this Parliament passed the Supremacy Act and the Uniformity Act: it also erected the Court of High Commission to deal with Church affairs. The Supremacy Act restored the great Reformation Acts of Henry VIII and

Edward VI, whilst the Uniformity Act restored, with certain significant exceptions, the second Prayer Book of Edward. Thus the main lines of the Reformation, which Mary had obliterated, were revived, and when Parliament rose, Cecil and, as I believe, Parker, with certain others, revised and enlarged the Injunctions of King Edward, which were directions concerning matters of Church order and ceremony. When these were ready, Visitors were sent round the country to administer to the clergy an oath in which due acknowledgement was made of these three points, the Royal Supremacy, the Prayer Book, and the Injunctions[1]. In all the chief Church centres throughout the length and breadth of the land Church people were assembled and the Injunctions were read out, and in sermons preached by special orators justification of the proposed changes was made. No soldiers were present, no show of force was made, no uprising of the people took place.

Thus, during the summer months of the year 1559, a bloodless revolution was effected which altered the whole aspect of the Church in England. No one supposes that the change was grateful to all, but it took place without popular protest. There was no Pilgrimage of Grace as there had been in Henry's reign, and no Kett's rebellion as there had been under Edward. Outwardly, at all events, the Reformation was restored. What opposition there was came from such of the clergy as scrupled the oath which was offered to them by the Visitors. The bishops, with one exception, refused to take it, and were deprived under the provisions of the Supremacy Act[2]. Of the inferior clergy a comparatively small number submitted to deprivation rather than take the oath of acknow-

[1] The actual manipulation of the Injunctions probably took place after Parliament was dissolved on May 8. In a letter written by Cecil, we find that they were ready by June 13, and an allusion in Parker's correspondence shows that he was concerned in drawing up the oath (Strype's *Parker* i. 95). It is probable that he and Cecil had the chief hand in the alterations. Cecil almost certainly drew up the last part of the Injunctions, viz. *The Admonition*, for a draft of it exists in his handwriting among the State Papers (S. P. Dom. xv. 27).

[2] Or two if Bishop Stanley of Sodor and Man be included. For the deprivation of the bishops see *Elizabethan Clergy* cap. II.

ledgement, and thus, whatever their real convictions may have been, the mass of English people allowed what the form of oath calls "the restoring again of the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual to the crown of the realm, and the abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same . . . the Book of Common Prayer . . . and the orders and rules contained in the Injunctions."

The whole of Elizabeth's first year was occupied in arranging and carrying out the settlement of religion which we have been considering. It is time now to turn our attention more particularly to the story of Archbishop Parker, whose influence so far, though real and decisive, I have not made apparent. The Cardinal Archbishop Pole had died a few hours before Elizabeth came to the throne. The vacancy in the See saved many complications. It was necessary to appoint a successor, and it is no wonder that Matthew Parker was designed from the first to occupy the throne of Canterbury. He had been chaplain to Anne Boleyn, mother of Elizabeth, and just before she went to the tower, Queen Anne specially commended her little girl to Parker's care, a charge of which he had been mindful[1]. Sir William Cecil, too, the Queen's foremost adviser, knew Parker well, as he had worked with him on many a piece of University business in which the future chief secretary learnt to appreciate the Doctor's sterling worth. Consequently, within three weeks of her accession, Elizabeth directed Sir Nicholas Bacon to summon Parker to London. It was with infinite alarm that Parker learnt the purport of the summons[2].

II

At this stage we may pause for a minute to see something of the new Archbishop's previous history, as it will prepare us not only for this unfeigned reluctance, but also for the

[1] Cf. Dixon, v. 39.

[2] Our authority for the dates in Parker's earlier life is a summary written by himself. It is printed at the end of his *Correspondence* in the Parker Society's series.

resolute pertinacity with which those in authority overruled his scruples. In his earlier life, then, Parker had received the double training of a scholar and of a man of affairs. In the year 1525, and at the age of twenty-one, he took his degree from Bene't, now Corpus Christi College, in Cambridge. As a young graduate and fellow of his college he devoted seven years to the study of the early centuries of Church history and literature. There can be no doubt that to this course of study, so full and so protracted, Parker's dispassionate balance on theological questions in an age of theological and partisan controversy is to be traced. When the seven years were over he became a public preacher, and very soon afterwards was called to the court of Queen Anne Boleyn as chaplain. By her gift he was introduced to what was probably to Parker the happiest time in all his life when he became Dean of Stoke in Suffolk. The life at Stoke involved just that quiet, useful, learned leisure which he had learned to love at Cambridge. He devoted himself to study, to training the young secular priests under his care, and to the development of the good estate of his little college at Stoke. His time here was an excellent preparation for the next important step in his life. In 1541 he was made master of his old college at Cambridge, though he did not yet resign the deanery of Stoke. To Cambridge, then, he returned after an absence of nine years, in the prime of life, with well-matured powers. In this wider arena he found fuller scope for that quiet business-like capacity which he had cultivated at Stoke. He was active in improving the college, and, as Vice-Chancellor, stepped at once into a foremost position in the University. He showed himself active, too, on more than one University commission in King Edward's reign, and in this way was brought into close association with Sir William Cecil.

It was during this period that Parker married a lady to whom he had long been tenderly attached, but could not marry until the Act which legalized the marriage of priests was passed. Margaret Harleston was worthy of his choice. She was destined to be his helpmeet for more than twenty years, adding grace to his home at Cambridge, soothing his

days of exile, and in many ways cheering and helping him in his subsequent anxious life at Lambeth. He was a man who needed the comfort of a good wife, not only on account of his sensitive and shrinking disposition, but because he was subject to frequent attacks of ill-health and depression. It is probable that a good deal of his success was due to Mrs Parker: it is certain that he failed rapidly when she was taken from him.

For the last few months of Edward's reign Parker enjoyed the rich deanery of Lincoln, and would doubtless have left his mark in that city, but in 1553 Edward died and Mary ascended the throne. Parker as a married priest was deprived of all his preferments, and retired into an obscurity which it is difficult to penetrate. But though we have no diary of his doings during Mary's reign, we know that he found the change from his late active life a grateful one, for he appears to have been beyond the reach of want, and to have spent five quiet years without the distraction of official business and without molestation. In his own words: "I lived as a private individual so happy before God in my conscience, and so far from being either ashamed or dejected, that the delightful literary leisure to which the good providence of God recalled me, yielded me much greater and more solid enjoyments than my former busy and dangerous kind of life had ever afforded me." So he describes those years, but a chance allusion in a later letter tells us of an accident which occurred at some time in Mary's reign, and which must have aggravated the tendency to ill-health of which mention has been made. He fell one day from his horse, and sustained an internal injury of so grave a character that he never completely recovered from it, and in the end it hastened his death[1].

III

Few and evil were the days of Mary, and when men began to forecast the parts that they were likely to play in the new reign, Parker thought not of deaneries or places of rich

[1] This accident resulted, it is probable, in strangulated hernia. This will account for his frequent illness, and it almost certainly led to his death.

emolument. His desire was to hold some post of learning and moderate activity, or at the most to take his share in the restoration of his beloved University, now sadly decayed. It was in such a mood that the call came to him to undertake the Primacy of all England. Probably no more sincere *nolo episcopari* was ever uttered than that which he addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, or the letter which he wrote to the Queen entreating her by way of final dissuasion to seek another man for archbishop[1]. "I am bold thus by my writing," he says to the Queen, "to approach to your high estate reverently on my knees, beseeching your honour to discharge me of that so high and chargeable an office, which doth require a man of much more wit, learning, virtue and experience, than I see and perfectly know can be performed of me, worthily to occupy it to God's pleasure, to your grace's honour, and to the wealth of your loving subjects, beside many other imperfections in me, as well for temporal ability for the furnishing thereof as were seemly to the honour of the realm, as also of infirmity of body, which will not suffer me to attend on so difficult a cure, to the discharge thereof in any reasonable expectation."

But Elizabeth and Cecil were merciless. It was a critical moment. The English Sees were being vacated by the old bishops who refused the oath, and a Primate was necessary who should himself be a wise man, and a prudent leader to the new bench of bishops. It is well that the mitre was forced on to Parker's head, for as we read down the list of names of men available at the moment, it is impossible to lay the finger on one who possessed the needed qualities of balanced judgement, of deep learning, of conciliation and gentleness combined with firmness and courage. And so Parker was consecrated sixtieth Archbishop of Canterbury. The consecration was performed in Lambeth Palace Chapel, on December 17, 1559, thirteen months after the Queen's accession. The length of this interval has occasioned surprise,

[1] The interesting letters which refer to his scruples will be found in the Parker Society's *Correspondence of Archbishop Parker* pp. 50 sqq.

and has been wrongly explained. It was due partly to events already described, namely, the cautious and almost secret negotiations with Parker, the prolonged conferences with the old bishops, the operation of the Visitation throughout the summer and autumn, during which ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction was suspended. There was really no place for an archbishop until the Visitation was concluded. But the delay was likewise due to less necessary circumstances, for the Queen wilfully delayed matters by certain transactions in regard to bishops' lands for the enrichment of her revenues; and these negotiations were, of course, carried out with better colour whilst the Sees were vacant, and there were no actual bishops to impoverish[1].

However, the months went round, and the consecration took place at the hands of Barlow, Hodgkin, Scory, and Coverdale, who were all of them bishops surviving in England, though at the time in possession of no See[2]. This memorable event of Parker's consecration is the connecting link between the ancient and modern succession of Orders in the Church of England. Through it that succession is traced up to the earliest times in an undoubted line. But it has been fiercely assailed in a controversy which has broken out again and again during 300 years. Roman Catholic writers have tried to cast ridicule upon the act by inventing a highly discreditable account of the way in which it was done. No sane person now listens to this fable. They have tried to prove that the bishops who took part in the laying-on of hands had no right or power to confer the episcopate. This contention has again and again been shown to be nugatory. Once more they have tried to make men believe that the form and accompaniments of the service used were uncanonical. This assertion, in like manner, has been disproved on the authority of ancient canons and precedents. Accordingly, in view of

[1] See Dixon, v. 187-9. The delay in Parker's consecration has been misrepresented by Roman Catholics as though it proceeded from fear. The true account is given above. The election of Parker had taken place on August 1, at the very moment that the Visitation was about to begin, and before its coming measures were generally known.

[2] Barlow was bishop-elect of Chichester and Scory of Hereford.

the whole range of such objections it is certain that on the strictest requirements of Church law and order, the consecration of Archbishop Parker was as valid as any consecration that history records. Parker himself, as though foreseeing the controversy which was destined to arise, has left a full and ample account of all that was done, so that it is really beyond cavil that Parker received himself, and so passed on the ancient orders of the Church of England[1].

From this point Parker's life is merged in the general history of the Church. The next great landmark is the Convocation of 1563. The interval between his consecration and that famous Convocation was taken up with the ceaseless routine of an archbishop's life. He joined in consecrating several bishops to vacant Sees, but his chief public act in those years was a metropolitical visitation of the southern province during part of 1560 and 1561. This was undertaken partly by himself and partly by his representatives, and its idea was to see how far people in general carried out the provisions of the Uniformity Act, and the Injunctions, and also to correct moral offences among clergy and laity. At its conclusion Bishop Horne of Winchester declared that the Supremacy, the Prayer Book, and the Injunctions were "commonly and everywhere almost throughout the realm received of all sorts." Horne's evidence is valuable because he knew both north and south of England, and it may be presumed that on his testimony the new order of things was, with certain exceptions, allowed at that time without general protest. But it was the calm before the storm of Puritan discontent and Romanist intrigue that was secretly brewing. In the year 1562 the sounds of the coming storm were heard. Religious disorders were breaking out in France, and the smothered hopes of many who were at heart discontented with the settlement began to revive. A great show of severity was therefore made in the issue of a new Ecclesiastical Commission, on

[1] For a convenient monograph on the whole subject of Parker's consecration see the Rev. E. Denny's *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, 1893. The subject has been recently handled by Dr Dixon, *History of the Church of England* v. 201, &c.

which Parker and twenty-six other prominent men were summoned to serve, but it does not appear that much rigour was exercised. Very few traces of the work of this commission have survived, but there can be no doubt that it involved a good deal of investigation, and that Parker's time was much occupied in considering returns of recusancy, which word now begins its long history[1].

IV

Let us now pass to the great Parliament and Convocation of 1563, which I have already described as a landmark in Parker's history. This second Parliament was convened for several reasons, and not least because of what the Lord Keeper called "the enemy as well here bred amongst us as abroad." In short, the fears of papal intrigue which had prompted the commission of the previous summer, had only increased in the meantime. France was an object of suspicion in the south, whilst in the north, Mary Queen of Scots was being carefully watched. There was a stern determination in consequence to press for severer measures against Romanists, and to abandon the more lenient policy followed so far. Accordingly, Parliament, when it met, passed an Act with severe penalties to assure the Royal Supremacy, and another Act to expedite the effect of spiritual censures. If these laws had been as rigorously pressed as they might have been, nothing less than a severe religious persecution would have resulted. It certainly does not appear that the authorities passed the Acts merely to strike terror. Parker thought otherwise, and was much troubled at the prospect of their rigorous enforcement. He did his best to mitigate their action by writing round to the bishops for this special purpose. And indeed, knowing the gentleness of the Archbishop's character, and regarding this action of his, it is exceedingly probable that the lenity shown in Elizabeth's early years is in great measure due to Parker's moderating influence. We have heard so much in recent years concerning the penal laws and

[1] For the facts in detail see *Elizabethan Clergy* caps. VIII–X.

their operation, that the lenity of which I speak has not been sufficiently noticed. Severe laws severely worked were to come, but the time was not yet, and it was only after the Pope excommunicated Elizabeth in 1570, and when plot after plot began to explode beneath the throne itself, that rigorous measures were carried out. This has been fully acknowledged on the side of the older Romanists by a Jesuit writer at the end of Elizabeth's reign. He says: "It cannot be denied that for the first ten years of Her Majesty's reign the state of [Roman] Catholics in England was tolerable, and after a sort in some quietness. Such as for their consciences were imprisoned in the beginning of her coming to the crown, were very kindly and mercifully used, the state of things then considered"[1].

The Convocation of 1563, which sat concurrently with the Parliament that passed these laws, was a synod of abiding influence[2]. The representative assembly of the Church of England took up once more its proper position in Church affairs. Of this Convocation Parker was the soul. He drew up the arrangements for it, and opened the proceedings with these notable words: "Behold the opportunity come for reforming the Church of England." The Council of Trent had lately been revived, and besides the intrigue already referred to, papal propagandists were busily launching books of controversy into England. Puritan doctrine, too, was being sown broadcast by Protestant refugees and others from the Continent, and with these certain even of the bishops were in some sympathy. Provision had been made for ritual and liturgical uniformity, and Parker felt that definite steps were necessary towards doctrinal uniformity, in view of the double danger of Tridentine Romanism and distempered Protestantism. Stated sermons and public discourses in defence of the religious

[1] The quotation is from W. W., *Important considerations* &c., 1601. The author is understood to be William Watson, who took some part in the arch-priest controversy. See a sketch of his life and an account of the book in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

[2] The Convocation of 1563 has been admirably handled by Dr Dixon, *History of the Church of England* v. 382. He has put together all our extant sources of information.

changes were being given all over the land, but it was necessary to ensure the doctrinal steadfastness of the preachers and of the clergy generally. Accordingly, Cranmer's Articles of Religion were taken in hand by Parker, and were revised, corrected, and expanded by him in preparation for this Convocation in order to direct the opinions of the clergy on certain fundamental points of belief, and on other matters of present controversy. As passed by Convocation at this time they were thirty-eight in number, and eight years later they received their final shape as the Thirty-nine Articles so familiar to us. They were very largely subscribed by the members of Convocation in 1563, but general clerical subscription was first enforced in 1571. In addition to the Articles of 1563, Homilies and Catechisms were also drawn up by prominent divines, and were published before the year was out.

Perhaps the passing of the Articles was the most important work of the synod. A far more warmly debated matter was the reopening of the question of Church ritual and ceremonial. It was really the beginning of the long controversy as to vestments and other matters which has stretched on into our own days. We must take a glance backwards. When the second Prayer Book of Edward VI was restored in 1559 certain significant changes had been made in it. Thus the Ornaments of the first Prayer Book were brought back, so that according to the letter of the rubric the vestments of the first Prayer Book were not only legal but were enjoined. But since the publication of the Prayer Book, changes were introduced into the ornaments of churches which seemed to be quite out of character with the ritual prescribed by the Ornaments Rubric for the officiating clergymen. Thus the Visitors of 1559 in many cases purged the churches of images and pictures, shrines, tapers, and so forth. Moreover the altars restored in Queen Mary's reign were universally pulled down by their action or advice, and Holy Tables of wood were set up[1]. This kind of action, carried

[1] I am making the ritual settlement of the early years of Elizabeth the subject of a separate inquiry, which inquiry is part of what I hope will be an exhaustive examination of Church Goods, 1545–1603, undertaken

out by such authority, must have given the general impression that, whatever the provisions of the Ornaments Rubric might be, yet practically the authorities were prescribing what was inconsistent with it. At all events the destruction of altars and images was a curious commentary on the rubric. The Visitors gave no orders, apparently, about the rood-lofts or chancel steps or fonts[1]. Many vicars and others took the law in regard to them into their own hands, and began to pull down or deface as they pleased. To restrain such arbitrary proceedings special orders were issued in 1561 to regulate the adaptation of the rood-lofts and to stop the demolition of chancel steps, and the destruction of fonts[2].

Now the unlicensed zeal of those who outwent the regulations of the Visitors and Commissioners before this order came out was a symptom of the early years of Elizabeth. There were indeed not a few clergymen who wished to go much further and to turn out of the churches the organs and so forth, and to get rid of every direction in the Prayer

jointly with my friend Mr W. Page, F.S.A. We intend to discover exactly what took place between the first fingering of Church goods and ornaments in 1545 and the death of Elizabeth. I have given in the text what I considered at the moment of writing to be the true account of what happened in regard to ornaments, but it must be supplemented and perhaps corrected by the fuller survey when that is complete. Unfortunately Dr Dixon has not gone into the changes in Church ornaments, nor has he examined the process by which the churches of England were entirely altered in respect of such ornaments and furniture.

[1] The rubric before the Ornaments Rubric enacts that the chancels should remain as they have done in times past. It was also in the book of 1552.

[2] The High Commission made this order October 10, 1561. It was rather shutting the stable door after the pony was stolen. Rather more than fifty churchwardens' accounts for the early years of Elizabeth have been printed, and they prove conclusively that in most of the places represented by these accounts, and in very different parts of England, altars were demolished and rood-lofts pulled down, if not in 1559, in the year or two which succeeded. The Injunctions of 1559, without directing that altars should be destroyed, seem to regard that destruction as probable, and regulate it accordingly. They say nothing about the rood-lofts, but the ordered abolition of tables (i.e. pictures) and images (Injunction 23) would necessitate the removal of the figures of the Blessed Virgin and St John on the rood-loft. The real truth seems to be that whatever the rubric might order in 1559, there was among people at large a general assumption that the *status quo* of 1553 was to be restored.

Book which allowed ornament, vestment, symbol, or ceremony. As we understand all this, we are in a position to appreciate the short but sharp ritual debate of 1563. There can be no doubt that in this Convocation a concerted attempt was made to undo the whole ritual settlement of the Prayer Book and Injunctions. This faction in Convocation were within an ace of succeeding in their endeavour. Their specific objections were festival days, the eastward position, the cross in baptism, kneeling at the communion, other vestments than the surplice, the use of organs. They were not successful, but the existence of a strong and organized Puritan element amongst the clergy was from this time forward a quantity which Archbishop Parker could not neglect.

V

We are therefore, at this point, face to face with the beginning of one chief line in Parker's activity for the remainder of his life. Puritanism becomes a solid fact from the time of this Convocation. Whether we ascribe it to the proselytizing efforts of the foreign refugees, or whether it was a natural reaction, or whatever may have been the cause, Puritan discontent with ecclesiastical habit, ornament, and ceremony increased daily. It will be quite unnecessary to follow it in detail. It was a cruel fate that the Archbishop, who was a man of peace, should have to pass so much of his few remaining years in mere policeman duty: sitting as High Commissioner; prescribing diocesan returns concerning conformity; vexing his righteous soul on account of the Queen's caprice, or the obstruction of open enemies like Lord Leicester; worn out in listening to the scruples of those who disliked the surplice. The most important stage in the controversy was the issue of the Advertisements. They were really a concession to the general dislike of vestments. As we have seen, the vestments and ornaments of Edward's first book were the actually legal ritual, though not much used in all probability. The Advertisements prescribed a compromise in the way of vestments, consisting of the surplice in parish churches and

the cope in cathedrals. These Advertisements are important because their concession as to vestments became the general rule in practice, and was embodied in a canon of 1604[1]. Thus, eventually, this minimum of ritual became the accepted law of the Church of England, and that in defiance or forgetfulness of the unrepealed Elizabethan rubric. Nor was the canon of 1604 overborne in practice by the new Ornaments Rubric of 1662, which directed that the ornaments of 1549 should "be retained and be in use."

Parker hated the uncongenial task of enforcing Uniformity, but he did not really grudge the labour. He felt increasingly that the real danger now looming in the distance was the menace of a Romanist confederacy against England, and he dreaded the effect of religious partisanship. Therefore he had said to Cecil in the year 1565, "Execution, execution, execution of laws and orders must be the first and the last part of good governance, although I yet admit moderations for times, places, multitudes"[2]. As a consequence of his policy, secession began, and the long history of English dissenting bodies takes its rise. The fanaticism of the Puritan clergy and their abettors was a sore puzzle to Parker. He had a shrewd suspicion that a good deal of it was fomented by Romanist emissaries. His suspicions were perhaps justified by a considerable rebellion in the north in 1569, when mass was again said in the minsters of Durham and Ripon[3]. Perhaps it was

[1] I take the view in the text that the Advertisements prescribe "a minimum of ritual," as this seems to me the only conclusion to be drawn from the chronological study of the records which deal with vestments. The vestments of the Prayer Book of 1549 (not those of any previous date) were, I take it, enacted by the rubric of Elizabeth's Prayer Book in 1559. Before the book was published, or the rubric was known, a great many of the clergy seem to have assumed that the ritual settlement of Edward's second Prayer Book was to be restored. Accordingly, in many cases, all vestments save the surplice were discarded. Then came out the Interpretations in 1561, and directed that the cope should be worn "in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministrations." The variety of practice which followed is notorious. At last, in 1566, the Advertisements made the final concession, receding from the obligatory use of the cope save in cathedrals. Thus, so far as vestments were concerned, the force of the Ornaments Rubric was evacuated.

[2] *Parker Correspondence* 246.

[3] See *Queen Elizabeth's Defence on her Proceedings in Church and State, with*

partly through the encouragement inspired by this rising that the Pope issued his bull of excommunication in 1570. This was followed two years later by the massacre of St Bartholomew's Day, when people in England began to tremble at the possibility of a Romanist crusade against this country. And certainly the closing years of Parker's primacy witnessed an enormous increase of papal propagandism. Three years before his death he says: "To certify the names and qualities throughout the realm of all such papists as do not like the religion, it were an infinite matter"[1]. He felt that strong measures were necessary. Some time before, he had directed careful replies to the numerous books which were being launched into England by Romanists abroad, but these apologies wrought conviction in few minds. So we find that the gentle Parker came to the conclusion that the removal of Mary Stuart was as necessary for the stability of the Church of England as it was for the safety of the state. With foreboding he had marked her presence in England in 1568, and in 1572 he had said: "If that only desperate person were away as by justice soon it might be, the Queen's Majesty's good subjects would be in better hope and the papists' daily expectation vanquished"[2]. It is, perhaps, no wonder that a fresh ecclesiastical commission was issued in 1572, to be followed next year by others for particular parts of England[3]. These commissions seem rather to have increased than to have abated the rising Puritan disaffection[4].

an introductory Essay on the Northern Rebellion (Church Historical Society, No. LVIII).

[1] *Correspondence* 398.

[2] In the same letter just quoted.

[3] The full history of the High Commission Court has not been written. In fact it is impossible to recover the early years of it. We have the various letters patent which directed the successive commissions, but the acts of the commission until about 1571 have not been preserved save in the shape of incidental reference or in a few documents preserved in the State Papers and other collections. For a list of the actual early commissions see *Elizabethan Clergy* 177 *note*.

[4] The year 1572 is a landmark in the Puritan controversy. A new parliament met and the Puritans took advantage of the opportunity to present their first *Admonition to Parliament*. It gave outrageous expression

VI

But there was a brighter side to Parker's work during all these weary years. A good deal of his spare time between 1563 and 1568 was devoted to the preparation of the Bishops' Bible, which in the latter year took the place of the Geneva version. The Archbishop superintended the work of translation, but his actual share in its execution remains doubtful: the interesting preface is certainly his. Parker also found frequent and grateful relaxation in his study, where he composed his chief work on the antiquities of the British Church, a series of biographical sketches of the Archbishops of Canterbury, intended to illustrate the continuity of the Church in this country. To his antiquarian tastes we are greatly indebted for the revival of the study of Anglo-Saxon; for the first attempt to edit the ancient chronicles of England; for the preservation of many choice books and manuscripts which would otherwise have perished[1]. As Strype says, he was a "mighty collector of books." Parker was certainly the first scholar in England after the Reformation to amass a considerable library, and this still survives in his own college at Cambridge[2]. No student of English Church history, no student of literature, no antiquary, can fail to regard Parker with gratitude for all that he did by deed and influence to promote the preservation of every memorial of antiquity, documentary and otherwise, that came in his way.

Two great sorrows befell him in the midst of such employments, in the death of his wife and of one of his sons. But

to their criticism of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, concentrating the bitterness and sarcasm of years. It opened a new era in the Puritan demands, for they desired no longer mere immunity from the habits, but the overthrow of the Church of England. The Admonition was answered by Whitgift. The Subscription Act of 1571 was rigorously pressed upon clergymen suspected of Nonconformity.

[1] See Dr Dixon's account, *History of the Church of England* v. 352–5.

[2] The useful catalogue of Nasmith, printed in 1777 at Cambridge, is still the official catalogue of the priceless list of manuscripts in the library of Corpus Christi College. The character and history of each manuscript have been recently examined by Dr Montague James, who has published the results of his inquiry.

he bore these trials with gentle dignity. He announced Mrs Parker's death to Cecil in these words: "It hath pleased Almighty God, whose will is always the best and must be obeyed, to offer unto me some matter of patience, and foolish frail nature troubleth me yet, so that I have much ado with myself to gather my wits and memory together, but I thank God that yet it hath pleased His mercy to suffer my poor faith to prevail against natural considerations, and my hope to bear quietly the wants of my small household commodities"[1]. In his wife, as these last words denote, he lost the comforter of many dark and painful days. There can be little doubt that his loss hastened his own death. There was little lifting of the burden in the months that remained. His last letter to Cecil, a month before his death, has a very sad ring. It recounts an aggravated return of his old disease; but what really troubles him is the desertion of friends, the caprice of the Queen, the misrepresentation of those who label him and Cecil as "great papists," and last but not least an outbreak of heretical opinions in England[2].

Archbishop Parker died on May 17, 1575, worn out at last by suffering and toil. He was not, perhaps, a great archbishop; he was too sensitive and retiring to be a statesman; but he saw intuitively the great strength of the Anglican position which he did so much to consolidate despite obloquy, despite misrepresentation, despite royal petulance, despite the machinations of Leicester and his party. He defended the Church's historic position against the Romanists. He brought the resources of deep learning to her aid, and as a prudent administrator added solidity to her institutions. He was gentle, wise, and good; a man of real but unobtrusive piety. In him there passed away the most attractive of the Elizabethan primates, the most learned man of his generation, perhaps the truest scholar of his time, and certainly not the least saintly of the long roll of English divines.

[1] *Correspondence* 368.
[2] *Correspondence* 479; cf. Strype, *Ann.* ii. 375.

II

RICHARD HOOKER

$155\frac{3}{4}$ — 1600

BY

A. J. MASON, D.D.

LADY MARGARET'S READER IN DIVINITY AT CAMBRIDGE
AND CANON OF CANTERBURY

RICHARD HOOKER

It would be hard, I think, to find anything new to say to English Church people on the subject of Richard Hooker. But there are many old and well-known things which it does us good to repeat, and to hear repeated. Our time to-day will be well spent, if this lecture induces any one, who has not yet done so, to read the brief Life of Hooker by that prince of biographers, the gentle Izaak Walton, or the Fifth Book of Hooker's own great work, or if it impels those who have read them to read them again with renewed interest. There is not much to add to Walton's narrative; nor is there really much to correct in it, unless it be in regard to what is probably the best-known incident which it contains, where the biographer makes his meek saint to take a wife blindly, on the recommendation of a lodging-house keeper with whom he chanced to stay for a day or two in London, and afterwards to tell his friends, who condoled with him for not finding in her "a more comfortable companion," that it was a wholesome discipline, by which he endeavoured to profit. The known facts show that Hooker's relations, not only with his wife but with her family, were not entirely unhappy; and the story itself seems ill to accord with the character of the man to whom history has attached the title of "Judicious," as it has attached the title of "Venerable" to Bede[1].

Born, as it seems, in the year 1553 or 1554, Richard Hooker

[1] See the article on Hooker in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

was a typical representative of Elizabethan England. He can hardly have remembered anything before Elizabeth's reign began, and he died three years before it ended. He came from that great western county which, through its adventurous sailor sons, contributed so largely to the splendour of the period. His forefathers of several generations had been Mayors of Exeter; his uncle, a well-known antiquary, was the Chamberlain of the city, and at one time its representative in Parliament. But these high civic connexions did not imply a wealthy home for the young Richard. His uncle commended him to the famous Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, himself a Devonshire man, whose *Apology of the Church of England* was ordered to be kept in every parish church in the kingdom and obtained almost the status of an authorized exposition of the principles of the Elizabethan settlement. The boy, accompanied by his good schoolmaster, was summoned to the palace at Salisbury, and examined; and from that time till the Bishop's early death, he had the powerful support of Jewell during his time at school and at Oxford. On his journeys between Oxford and Exeter, which were performed on foot, Salisbury, by the Bishop's command, was always made a halting-place. Jewell "lent" Hooker the "horse" which had carried him "with much ease" for many a mile, in the shape of a walking-staff which had served him during his wanderings as an exile in Germany, enjoining him to bring it back, and promising him ten groats for each time he did so.

Scholar, and afterwards Fellow, of Corpus Christi College, where during four years he was only twice absent from the chapel service, he gained a great reputation as a tutor, and endeared himself to his pupils. He spent his time, Walton says, "enriching his quiet and capacious soul with the precious learning of the philosophers, casuists, and schoolmen; and with them the foundation and reason of all laws, both sacred and civil; and with such other learning as lay most remote from the tract of common studies." He acted for some time as Deputy Professor of Hebrew in the University. But his marriage put an end to his Fellowship, and he went down

to a poor country living in Buckinghamshire, given to him by a private patron.

When Hooker was thirty-one or thirty-two years of age, he was summoned to the chief public labour of his life, as Master of the Temple in London. The Temple had fallen under a markedly Puritan influence. Walter Travers, who occupied the post of Reader there, was next after Cartwright the most influential and prominent leader of that party. He had himself sought and received a re-ordination at the hands of the presbyters of Antwerp, and had set his heart upon establishing "the discipline" in the Temple. Sandys, Archbishop of York, the friend of Hooker's early patron, Jewell, and the father of one of his most devoted pupils, recommended Hooker for the Mastership, and obtained the appointment for him. It was no pleasant position in which Hooker was thus placed. Although Travers and he were on terms of mutual respect and personal courtesy, it was impossible but that the difference of their opinions should betray itself. Travers was outspoken in his attacks upon the established order of things, and Hooker felt constrained to defend it. "The pulpit," according to Fuller, "spake pure Canterbury in the morning, and Geneva in the afternoon." Scandal was caused by the open opposition; and the cause of the Church was hardly advanced by the sudden serving of an inhibition upon Travers one Sunday afternoon, when he was about to begin his sermon,—"when," as Fuller puts it, "the cloth and napkins were laid, yea the guests set, and their knives drawn for their spiritual repast." The factious spirit was embittered, and Travers preferred against Hooker an accusation of heresy—amongst other things, because he had gone so far as to say that through the mercy of God it was possible even for Papists to be saved, when they knew no better. The accusation was repelled; but the place of controversy, even after Travers's departure, became so distasteful to the charitable Hooker, that he begged Archbishop Whitgift to remove him again to "some quiet country parsonage, where," he said, "I may see God's blessings spring out of my mother earth, and eat mine own bread in peace and privacy."

It was Hooker's design, in such a retirement, to undertake with his pen what it pained him to do with his tongue, and to carry the controversy with Puritanism to its completion in a calmer atmosphere. He had served six years at the Temple, when in 1591 Whitgift appointed him to a living in Wiltshire, where four Books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* were written and published. Four years later he was removed to Bishopsbourne, near Canterbury, where he wrote the fifth. The great yew hedges of the rectory garden are those beside which he paced, and the dark and venerable rafters of the present dining-room are said to be those under which he breathed his last. There, for five years more, he set an example of the studious and disciplined country parson. Diligent in preaching, catechizing, and visiting; promoting in every way charity and neighbourliness amongst the parishioners; he was also constant in fasting and prayer. He "did usually," according to Walton, "every Ember-week, take from the parish clerk the key of the church door, into which place he retired every day and locked himself up for many hours; and did the like most Fridays and other days of fasting." This worthy parish clerk, who loved to show visitors the grave of Hooker and to talk of his life at Bishopsbourne, continued in his office until the time of the Long Parliament, when Hooker's successor was sequestered, and "a Genevian minister" put in his place. The Communion was to be celebrated, after the "Genevian" fashion, the communicants seated round the Table. The minister ordered the clerk to fetch joint stools and cushions for them. "When the clerk saw them begin to sit down, he began to wonder; but the minister bade him cease wondering and lock the church door. To whom he replied, 'Pray take you the keys and lock me out; I will never come more into this church; for all men will say my master Hooker was a good man and a good scholar, and I am sure it was not used to be thus in his days.' And report says, the old man went presently home and died."

Although a sister of Richard Hooker lived, it is said, to the age of 121 years, his own health can never have been robust. In the autumn of the year 1600 he caught a violent cold in

going by boat from London to Gravesend. It was his last illness. During the course of it his house was robbed. His only concern was for his books and written papers—for the three completing books of his great work were still in manuscript.

On All Saints' Day he was visited by his friend and confessor, the learned Saravia, Canon of the Cathedral of Canterbury, who gave him absolution and the blessed Sacrament of our Saviour's Body and Blood. Returning early on the morrow, Saravia "found him better in appearance, deep in contemplation, and not inclinable to discourse." He asked what was the subject of his thoughts; "to which he replied, that he was meditating the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which peace could not be in heaven; and oh that it might be so on earth." He fell soon after "into a dangerous slumber"; from which he only awoke to say that he was at peace with all men, and God at peace with him; that he had that inward joy which the world could neither give nor take away; and that he could wish, though he could not hope, to live to do the Church more service. So Richard Hooker died.

It is impossible to exaggerate the debt which the Church of England owes to Hooker. At the time when his great work was taken in hand, it might have seemed to an acute observer impossible for the Church of England to maintain for many years the position which at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign it had adopted. The Puritan party had gained such an ascendency, partly by the excellence and earnestness of its leading champions, such as Cartwright and Travers—partly by the very definite and easily stated character of the system which they advocated—partly by the success which had attended the establishment of their system at Geneva, in Scotland, and in the reformed communities of France and Holland, that they seemed bound to carry all England with them. The Puritan party was not contented to hold a place as a tendency or school of thought within the Church, side by side with other tendencies or schools; it would not have been willing to seek toleration for itself outside the Church of

England in the form of a rival ecclesiastical organization. It sought to reform the existing Church and bring it wholly over to the Genevan pattern, in doctrine, in worship, and in discipline. It would utterly have extirpated, even if need be by the sword, all dissent from itself, and compelled every English man, woman, and child, from the Sovereign downwards, to be subject to its rigid, if lofty, requirements.

In comparison with this new system, the settlement made at the beginning of the reign must have seemed an illogical and half-hearted thing. It had been arrived at by no very precise or doctrinaire method. This item and that item in medieval Christianity had been cut away, because it was felt to be superstitious and unprofitable; but the result was, in the opinion of many ardent souls, to leave a barely modified Popery—an ill-assorted and indefensible collection of doctrines and practices which had only been left for a time because public opinion was not yet ready for anything more thorough. And the men who represented this poor compromise brought it still further into contempt. The mass of the clergy were illiterate men, who made scarcely an effort to teach what they were supposed to believe. They did not themselves know. Most of the Elizabethan bishops were third-rate men, both in attainments and in character. The best among them, with a few exceptions, were in secret sympathy with the Puritan movement, and if they had followed the instincts of conscience rather than the dictates of interest would have sided openly with it, instead of pretending spasmodically to take part in its suppression.

It was in this state of things that Richard Hooker came upon the field. He restored to the Church of England her self-respect. He made men feel that Puritanism, with its Presbyterian government and its Calvinistic dogmas, had no exclusive claim upon the consciences of spiritually-minded men, who wished to be loyal to the Scriptures. He showed that the position taken up by the Anglican reformers was capable of being defended by other weapons than those of administrative persecution, or of unscrupulous and cruel

ridicule. The cause was all but lost; and Hooker himself, in the preface to his great work, describes himself as undertaking it by way of recording a protest against what appeared well-nigh inevitable; "that posterity may know we have not loosely, through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a dream." Owing mainly to Hooker, posterity has no need to look back upon Anglicanism as a passing phase in the history of our island Christianity, like the Interim in the Christianity of Germany. Much is, no doubt, due to the sagacity of Elizabeth herself. I do not forget the work of Whitgift, Hooker's patron, nor of Saravia, his friend, nor of Bilson, nor of Bancroft; but far above them all it was Hooker who kept open the ground upon which Andrewes and Overall, Herbert and Ferrar, Ken and Bull, and Wilson and Butler were afterwards to show what can come of that type of reformed Catholicism which the Puritan movement so scathingly condemned.

For this task he was qualified by a great combination of gifts. To begin with, the majesty of his literary style was a thing new to religious controversy. Such prose as his — never stilted nor bombastic, always pointed and often racy, but never losing its lofty dignity—was unknown in England before; and even now it makes his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, apart altogether from its religious value, one of the chief glories of English literature.

Hooker's style itself must have exercised a reassuring influence upon the upholders of the Elizabethan polity; and his learning even more so. He was confronted by opponents who possessed no inconsiderable amount of learning; but theirs was flimsy and superficial compared with his. As the present Bishop of Oxford says, in his excellent Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker, "It is utterly astonishing to look at the list of the books which he uses in his work, and at the exacting thoroughness of his extant writings; to think of the vast amount of his labour of which no trace remains,—and to remember that he was only forty-seven when he died"[1].

[1] F. Paget, *Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker* 7.

But it was not only his mastery of language and his well-digested erudition which made Hooker so powerful a vindicator of the English Church. It was the philosophic breadth and far-reaching power of thought which lay in those slowly-fashioned books of his. Sufficient answers for practical purposes might have been given—and had often been given — to the Puritan objections against one point and another of our ritual and our constitution, without treating them very comprehensively. Most men are too impatient to go to the root of such questions as they raised. They even pride themselves upon their unwillingness to argue about square caps and surplices, about rings in marriage or crosses in baptism, sometimes even about the necessity of bishops and the rightful place of elders. Not so the great Hooker. He was not above examining these subjects in detail; but before he did so, he examined at full length the presuppositions which, whether the men themselves perceived them or not, lay beneath all the Puritan contentions. Like the Creator Himself, he

"Cast the dark foundations deep."

He begins with four Books which deal with important principles. The first is concerned with laws in general—how the force of all laws is derived from that law which the Creator of the world set for His own action before the universe was framed, and how different in their spheres of operation are the laws which nevertheless are traceable to that supreme law—the laws which govern natural agents and those which govern angels, the laws whereby man is directed to the imitation of God, whether taught by reason, or imposed by societies of men, or revealed directly by God. He proceeds to examine whether Scripture contains the whole Divine law in such a sense that whatever we do, which is not actually prescribed in it, is sin; and whether we are bound to suppose that the form of Church government is to be found laid down in Scripture, and may never be changed. In this point the Puritans of Hooker's day took exactly the opposite line to that of those who in the main represent them now.

Now they are fond of saying that Christ and His Apostles gave no rules for the government of the Church, so that a Presbyterian government, or any other that is found serviceable, has as much sanction as that which has actually existed in Christendom since apostolic times. Under Elizabeth they contended that the government established by Calvin, under elders of various descriptions, was positively dictated by Scripture, and that any other was a defiance of the Divine will. In yet another book Hooker goes on to show that things are not necessarily wrong because they are common to us and to Rome, though banished from the foreign reformed communities. Not till after all this massive preliminary work does Hooker approach the definite points in dispute; and even then, every point is treated in connexion with large and luminous principles; so that, for instance, the proper order of the administration of the sacraments is seen to depend upon the doctrine of the sacraments themselves, and the doctrine of the sacraments upon the doctrine of the Incarnation, and that upon the doctrine of the Trinity, so that the Fifth Book of Hooker is nothing less than a masterly *Summa* of dogmatic theology, of which no other Church in Christendom has the like.

And with all his breadth and range of thought, with all his command of language, with all his firmness and force of conviction, Hooker never wrote what would needlessly pain an opponent. As one of those most like him in mind of modern days has said of him[1], he was more intent on showing *why* his opponents were wrong than in showing the fact that they were so. He never allows his humour or his irony to carry him too far. He cares too much for the truth to risk it upon an epigram. He was, throughout, the same charitable, studious, unworldly, humble man, who was found tending the sheep, Horace in hand, while his servant dined, and rocking the cradle to relieve his unappreciative wife,—whom his pupils could easily look out of countenance, and who always treated his poor parish clerk as his equal. In his absolute

[1] Dean Church.

loyalty to the unconflicting claims of reason, of revelation, and of history, Hooker is a pattern to all Christian scholars, and the true type of the Church in which he was reared; in his reverence for law, in his courage and his self-devotion, in his cheerful and patient contentment, he is an example to us all.

III

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH

1602–1644

BY

HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., D.C.L.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF NEW COLLEGE OXFORD
AND PREACHER AT LINCOLN'S INN

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH

WHATEVER doubts may be felt as to the theological temper and ecclesiastical tendencies of the English people at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, there can be none as to its religious attitude at the end of it. However partially, reluctantly, gradually the Reformation may have been accepted in the first instance, by the end of Elizabeth's reign it was as well and firmly established as it was in any country of Europe. The disputes and disagreements between the government and the discontented, between the prelates and the public, between the Church and the sectaries, related almost entirely to questions of ecclesiastical order and discipline, hardly at all to theology. Protestantism was everywhere dominant, and Protestantism in its stern, uncompromising Calvinistic form. Such was the accepted view of the great mass of the clergy and still more of the religious laity—at least in the more enlightened and progressive parts of the country. Early in the seventeenth century, however, this gloomy and narrow creed began to provoke a reaction. It came, like most new tendencies of thought, largely from the Universities, and affected especially a section of the younger and more cultured clergy. The reaction assumed different forms in the two Universities. At Cambridge it assumed a philosophical shape. Learned men, brought up in one of the strictest schools of Puritanism—Emmanuel College—were driven back from a theology full of arbitrary predestination, everlasting torments, Moloch-like theories of substitutive sacrifice, to the purer philosophy of Plato and his followers among the early Christian fathers. The result was a school of

Christian Platonists, and a wider school of Cambridge "Latitudinarians." At Oxford the reaction took a more distinctly ecclesiastical turn. Men, learned enough to know how modern a thing, how arbitrary, how little primitive, was the Genevan pattern of Church government, and still more of theology, appealed against it to the theology of the primitive Church. The movement centres round the name of Laud. Under the influence of this movement, the Churches and their services began to resume much of their medieval garniture. The use of the surplice was insisted upon with unwonted strictness. The communion table was put back from the centre of the church to the east wall, and resumed the name of altar. In places, the eastward position, lights, bowings, vestments, elaborate music reappeared. The marriage of Charles I with a Roman Catholic princess brought with it increased toleration of her Church. At Rome hopes were entertained of the reconversion of England or of some compromise with the Anglican Church. Men who had been forced to admit that the English Church had given up some things in doctrine and ritual which really did come down from the primitive Church, to whose authority, be it remembered, even the Puritans were not unwilling to appeal, could not but ask themselves whether the English Church had not sacrificed too much to remain really Catholic; whether the Protestant case, discovered in some matters to be untenable, might not ultimately prove untenable in all; whether the abuses of the Middle Age or of modern Romanism were not after all removable accidents of the Romish system. In such a state of feeling it was not surprising that learned and able young men should sometimes be caught by the wiles of the keen and subtle Jesuit controversialists who, under cover of the Court, found their way into England. Among those who fell victims to their intrigues was the subject of to-day's lecture, William Chillingworth.

William Chillingworth was the son of a mayor of Oxford; born close to Carfax (1602); baptized in the old City Church, St Martin's, Carfax; educated perhaps at Magdalen College School; afterwards a Fellow of Trinity College. His god-

father was William Laud, then a Fellow, afterwards President, of St John's, the leader of the Catholic reaction. "He was then," we are told by Wood, "observed to be no drudge at his study, but being a man of great parts would do much in a little time, when he settled to it." He spent much time meditating or disputing in the delightful grove or garden of his college. He was distinguished as a mathematician, as a poet, as a theologian. He was admitted to the friendship of the most learned and cultivated men of his time—Lucius Carey, afterwards known as Viscount Falkland, John Hales of Eton, Gilbert Sheldon Archbishop of Canterbury. The controversy with the Puritans on the one side and the Roman Church on the other was then the great subject of intellectual interest at Oxford. Laud's godson found himself unable to resist the arguments of the Jesuit John Fisher, still remembered for his controversy with the Archbishop, being chiefly impressed with the necessity for an infallible living judge in matters of faith. He sacrificed brilliant prospects in England, went into exile, and became a student in the famous Jesuit College at Douai. His further studies, however, instead of clearing away, brought back the old difficulties. A correspondence with his godfather helped him back to Protestantism and to England; but he long retained scruples about subscribing the Articles of the Church of England. At last, however, his scruples were overcome, and in 1638 he became Chancellor and Prebendary of Sarum, and Master of a hospital at Leicester. A few years later the Civil War rudely disturbed the studies of controversial divines. Chillingworth accompanied the King's army at the siege of Gloucester. Turning his classical studies to account he devised an imitation of the old Roman method of storming a town by means of a testudo, which enabled the besiegers to advance to the walls under cover of a network of interlaced shields. When the siege of Gloucester was raised, Chillingworth accompanied the King's forces to Arundel, and ultimately found himself a prisoner in Arundel Castle. He was seriously ill. A Presbyterian divine and old opponent, William Cheynell, secured him leave to go to Chichester, where in 1644 (O. S.

1643) he died, and was buried in the cathedral. He was much worried during his last illness by the inopportune attacks of Cheynell, who at the funeral threw Chillingworth's principal book (with a volley of pious imprecations) into the author's grave, and published a venomous attack upon his late opponent[1].

The principal work of Chillingworth is styled *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way of Salvation.* Seldom has so important a work had so accidental an origin. It is a detailed reply to a book called *Mercy and Truth; or Charity maintained by Catholics*, the work of a Jesuit named Edward Knott, which was a single item in a controversial war between that divine and Dr Christopher Potter, Provost of Queen's. The book was written at Great Tew, the country seat of Falkland during the days when that cultivated statesman was playing his famous part as a moderate Parliamentarian in the great conflict between the infatuated monarch and his exasperated subjects, and was published in 1637. Chillingworth was a young man, and (as things went in that learned age) not exceptionally learned: he owed much to Falkland's wide reading as well as to his ample library. As a model of controversial style and logic it has won high praise from Hobbes, Locke, and Archbishop Tillotson. Its English is peculiarly free from the faults of the age—over-elaboration, excessive ornament, a surfeit of ponderous and unwieldy learning. He avoids, almost entirely, abusive language, exaggeration, sophistry, and may still be read with pleasure and interest. Any elaborate attempt to condense his argument into a single lecture would, I fear, prove tedious and unprofitable. A few points must be selected for remark.

The book deals chiefly with the particular side of the Roman controversy which had played the most prominent part in Chillingworth's own vicissitudes of creed, the supposed necessity for a living infallible authority in matters of faith. Never has the delusiveness of those promises of absolute certainty and religious peace which Rome holds out to per-

[1] By his will he left to the Mayor and Corporation of Oxford a sum of £400 to be spent in apprenticing poor boys.

plexed and doubting souls been more remorselessly exposed. Chillingworth insists on the impossibility of avoiding reliance upon private judgement, for it is by an act of private judgement that the individual accepts the authority upon which he relies. There is private judgement at every turn. It is by an act of private judgement that he determines what are the books of Holy Scripture: at this stage the authority of the Church cannot be invoked, for it is by Scripture that the authority of the Church is to be proved. It is by an act of private judgement that the individual must determine that Holy Scripture is infallible; by an act of private interpretation that he must conclude that the Holy Scripture promises the gift of infallibility to some definite man or body of men; by an act of private judgement that he concludes that this body is the Roman Church; by an act of private judgement that he determines what is the supreme authority in the Roman Church. And here of course the champions of Rome were at variance among themselves: for in Chillingworth's time it was not yet decided whether a Pope was above a Council or a Council above the Pope, or whether the union of Pope and Council was necessary to express the infallible voice of the Church. And this was not the only uncertainty which remained even after the act of renunciation which was supposed to resolve all difficulties and to end all doubts. Chillingworth's study of ecclesiastical history had shown him how outrageous was the pretension that the See of Rome had never varied in its doctrinal decisions—even on such a fundamental point as the question what are the books of Holy Scripture. It was the boast of Rome that the Protestants could not prove the authority of Holy Scripture or determine what Holy Scripture was without invoking that authority of the Church which in other matters they denied. Chillingworth replies that so late a Pope as Gregory the Great had denied the character of Holy Scripture to the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as to some books in the Old Testament Apocrypha which Rome in his day accepted. The books of Holy Scripture were too difficult, the Roman controversialist alleged, for either plain man or learned to interpret them for

himself; therefore there must be an inspired and infallible interpreter. Yet the inspired interpreter had constantly contradicted himself. In particular the difficulties of translation and the uncertainties of text had been insisted on as objections to the Protestant reliance on the Bible. Chillingworth replies by pointing to the successive revisions of the Vulgate. Pope Sixtus V and Pope Clement VIII had each of them issued what purported to be authoritative, infallible, and final texts and translations of the sacred books: and of the Clementine version there had been several editions all equally authoritative. After such variations how was the Roman Catholic any better off than the Protestant? how could any one be sure that his infallible oracle had come to the end of its series of infallible revisions of a text already infallible?

Then there is the alleged necessity for external unity, and the constant harping upon the differences among Protestants. Chillingworth had seen enough of the Roman Church from within to know how delusive was this promise of unity. Within the Roman Church as without there were controversies, differences among doctors, rival and warring schools, parties, tendencies, religious orders. Above all, he insists on the uselessness of an infallible authority, unless there was also an infallible guide to the infallible authority. There was as much difficulty upon the Roman theory in deciding what infallibility had decreed as there was upon the Protestant theory in making out the truth for oneself. The infallible voice could only be elicited by wending one's way through a chaos of conciliar canons or papal decrees—all encumbered and obscured by forgeries and corruptions and uncertainties of text, apparent discrepancies requiring infinite ingenuity to reconcile, interpretations which were just as obscure as the obscurities they were intended to clear up. And then upon very many of the doubts and difficulties which practically perplexed the seeker after truth the oracle had never uttered—nay, remained obstinately dumb.

"What an impudence is it to pretend," says Chillingworth, "that your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, whereas there are thousands of places

of Scripture which you do not pretend certainly to understand, and about the interpretation whereof your own doctors differ among themselves." If it be replied that sufficient certainty is given to point out the way of salvation, and that certainty about non-fundamentals was not necessary, this was exactly the Protestant case—that Scripture was plain enough in essentials, and that no man who honestly tried to reach the truth would miss salvation through involuntary ignorance or want of understanding. Moreover, for the unlearned at least, the argument from the necessity or convenience of an infallible judge does not go far enough.

"'But it is more useful and fit,' you say, 'for the deciding of controversies, to have, besides an infallible rule to go by, a living infallible judge to determine them: and from hence *you* conclude that certainly there is such a judge.' But why then may not another say, that it is yet more useful, for many excellent purposes, that all the patriarchs should be infallible, than that the pope only should? Another, that it would be yet more useful that all the archbishops of every province should be so, than that the patriarchs only should be so. Another, that it would be yet more useful if all the bishops of every diocese were so. Another, that it would be yet more available that all the parsons of every parish should be so. Another, that it would be yet more excellent if all the fathers of families were so. And, lastly, another, that it were much more to be desired that every man and every woman were so; just as much as the prevention of controversies is better than the decision of them; and the prevention of heresies better than the condemnation of them; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very consequence, that not only a general council, nor only the pope, but all the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, pastors, fathers, nay, all the men in the world, are infallible; if you say now, as I am sure you will, that this conclusion is most gross and absurd, against sense and experience, then must also the ground be false from which it evidently and undeniably follows, viz. that that course of dealing with men seems always more fit to Divine providence, which seems most fit to human reason"[1].

[1] *Works* i. 249.

It is more reasonable, Chillingworth contends, to infer that since God has not (so far as we can judge) given us an infallible arbiter of religious controversies, therefore it is best there should be no such arbiter, than to invent such an arbiter to satisfy our preconceived opinion as to his necessity or utility.

Chillingworth goes on to point out in how many ways the Roman theories positively increased the uncertainties of the individual's salvation which it is supposed to remove, in particular the Roman doctrine of intention. Salvation is made to depend upon a valid baptism, eucharist, absolution. No sacrament is really conferred unless the administrator of it intended to confer it. What a vista of uncertainty does this open up!

There is the doubt, "first, that he was baptized with due matter. Secondly, with the due form of words, which he cannot know, unless he were both present and attentive. Thirdly, he must know that he was baptized with due intention, and that is, that the minister of his baptism was not a secret Jew, nor a Moor, nor an Atheist (of all which kinds, I fear, experience gives you just cause to fear, that Italy and Spain have priests not a few), but a Christian, in heart as well as profession (otherwise, believing the sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing), nor a Sabellian, nor an Arian, but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And, lastly, that he was neither drunk nor distracted at the administration of the sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention.

"Fourthly, he must undertake to know that the bishop which ordained him priest ordained him completely with due matter, form, and intention; and, consequently, that he again was neither Jew, nor Moor, nor Atheist, nor liable to any such exception as is inconsistent with due intention in giving the sacrament of orders.

"Then, fifthly, he must undertake to know, that the bishop which made him priest was a priest himself; for your rule

is *Nihil dat quod non habet*: and consequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his baptism, which might make him incapable of ordination, nor no invalidity in his ordination, but a true priest to ordain him again, the requisite matter and form and due intention all concurring.

"Lastly, he must pretend to know the same of him that made him priest, and him that made him priest, even until he comes to the very fountain of priesthood. For take any one in the whole train and succession of ordainers, and suppose him, by reason of any defect, only a supposed, and not a true priest; then, according to your doctrine, he could not give a true, but only a supposed priesthood; and they that receive it of him, and again, they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and shadow, can give nothing but a name and shadow; and so from age to age, from generation to generation, being equivocal fathers beget only equivocal sons; no principle in geometry being more certain than this, that 'the unsuppliable defect of any necessary antecedent must needs cause a nullity of all those consequences which depend upon it.' In fine, to know this one thing you must first know ten thousand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known, there being no necessity that it should be true which only can qualify anything for an object of science, but only at the best a high degree of probability that it is so. But then, that of ten thousand probables no one should be false; that of ten thousand requisites, whereof any one may fail, not one should be wanting; this to me is extremely improbable, and even cousin-german to impossible. So that the assurance hereof is like a machine composed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is strangely unlikely but some will be out of order; and yet if any one be so, the whole fabric of necessity falls to the ground: and he that shall put them together, and maturely consider all the possible ways of lapsing, and nullifying a priesthood in the Church of Rome, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that, amongst a hundred seeming priests, there is not one true one: nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that amongst

those many millions which make up the Romish hierarchy, there are not twenty true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that they which make men's salvation (as you do) depend upon priestly absolution, and this again (as you do) upon the truth and reality of the priesthood that gives it, and this, lastly, upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fittest men in the world to object to others, as a horrible crime, 'that they make men's salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain foundations.' And let this be the first retorting of your argument"[1].

If the controversialist replies that God will not damn a man for invalidities which are no fault of his, once again his case against the Protestant is undermined. The Protestant who honestly does not think that salvation depends upon valid sacraments, or who does not think Apostolical succession necessary to their validity, may be saved as well as the Papist absolved by a priest without intention. If errors of private judgement do not forfeit salvation, the Protestant honestly using his private judgement is in no worse case than the Papist. It is observable, however, that Chillingworth usually assumes in this and other cases that the more charitable view will not be taken by his opponent. At the present day the more charitable and hopeful views which Chillingworth puts into his opponent's mouth, more for the sake of completeness than because he thinks they will seriously be adopted, would no doubt be generally accepted by the better advocates of Romanism. But it is probable that even now the idea that salvation may be missed for the want of some mechanical passport to heaven plays a large part in creating that alarm for one's personal salvation which still drives minds of a certain type into the arms of the Roman Church.

I dare say you will be growing impatient of these excursions into a controversy which is for most of us a matter of merely historical interest. For the few who really are inclined to treat seriously the claims of the Roman Church, Chillingworth may still be recommended as an excellent medicine. But even for those who are not so inclined, it is

[1] *Works* ii. 202.

wholesome to know enough about the Roman controversy to see how weak the case of Rome really is. We very often find a tendency to insist on the strength of the Roman case among people who have not the slightest intention of being convinced by it, still less of acting upon their own arguments. For instance, "The only logical thing to do is to become a Roman Catholic." "All or nothing: the Anglican Church is a mere illogical compromise." "If I were to believe in any Church, I should believe in the Church of Rome." How often do we hear utterances of this kind carelessly thrown out as an excuse for indifference or Agnosticism, or at least for bestowing a distant and half-hearted allegiance upon the Church which the disputant condescends to patronize!

It is well therefore to realize how weak is the case of Rome as against any or all of her numerous rivals and opponents. But I must acknowledge that the reflection is borne in upon me, as I read Chillingworth, that the case is not equally weak as against all classes of those opponents. Thomas Hobbes, we are told, would often say of Chillingworth that he was "like a lusty fighting fellow that did drive his enemies before him, but would give his own party smart back-blows." I doubt whether this would very often be the case against those who really maintained Chillingworth's own position; he is singularly on his guard against the controversialist's error of proving too much. But certainly his arguments would often recoil upon the straiter sect of high Anglicans who claimed for the Universal Church (however interpreted) much of what his opponents claimed for the Church of Rome. And still more often Chillingworth's arguments are valid (as I venture to think) against the far more extravagant claims made by some in our own day for a Church which it is almost impossible to get them to define with accuracy or consistency.

On the whole, Chillingworth cannot be reckoned among the High-Churchmen, even as High-Churchmanship was understood in the seventeenth century. He belonged (in spite of his Oxford education) rather to the Latitudinarian or liberal school. His scruples about subscription arose chiefly from his

objection to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. But the liberal party of those days was not so sharply opposed to the High-Church school of the day as has since been the case. The more enlightened disciples of Laud and the more Anglican Latitudinarians were brought together by their common championship of learning and religious sobriety, their common opposition to Calvinistic theology, to Calvinistic ethics, and to Puritan fanaticism. Laud himself was the patron of Chillingworth and of Hales. Still, Chillingworth was a thoroughly loyal son of the English Church, and he has always been reckoned one of the typical representatives of Anglican theology. And therefore it is significant to notice how much less this favoured protégé of Laud claimed either for the Church at large or for the Church of England than is claimed for them by modern High-Churchmen. He explicitly repudiates the theory that the Apostolical succession is essential to the existence of a true Church, and in effect denies that ordination can be said to confer anything of the nature of an indelible "character." A whole chapter bears the heading "No Church of any one denomination infallible." Nor is infallibility claimed for the whole Universal Church in any of the senses in which that term is wont to be understood—neither for a consent of the Fathers (whose divergences Chillingworth never tires of exhibiting), nor for that residuum of truth in which the Roman, Greek and Anglican Church agree, nor for the undivided Churches of East and West, nor for the general councils of the past or a possible general council of the future, nor for any other isolated utterance or utterances.

Passing on to another point, Chillingworth recognizes the Church as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ: but he insists upon its decision as to what books constitute Holy Scripture simply as historical testimony which appeals to the reason, not as the utterance of an oracle. He admits that the Church has authority to settle controversies and to expel or excommunicate those who reject its decrees, but he compares its authority to the authority of judges and magistrates, which conveys no exemption from the ordinary human liability to

error. And for himself he urged a wide latitude of opinion within the Church. His ideal was a "unity of charity and mutual toleration"—as far as possible, we may presume, within the limit of the same communion; or where that is not possible, between the members of bodies which cannot agree to profess the same creed or worship in the same buildings. He realizes, again, that there may be degrees of unity, degrees of communion between Christians. There may be partial intercommunion between Churches that for some purposes are distinct. Even to the Papist he can say: "Yet notwithstanding all your errors, we do not renounce your communion totally and absolutely, but only leave communicating with you in the practice and profession of your errors. The trial whereof will be to propose some form of worshipping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and herein if we refuse to join with you, then, and not till then, may you justly say we have utterly and absolutely abandoned your communion"[1].

A man who could write like that could not have talked of a hard and fast distinction between those in the Church and those in schism, have unchurched dissenters for want of valid orders or even for the conscientious neglect of sacraments which he himself believed to be of divine authority. Chillingworth is one of the first great advocates of toleration and religious liberty, and that not only in the sense of legal toleration and legal liberty.

No more trenchant criticism upon the belief in an infallible voice of the Church is to be found anywhere than in the writings of Chillingworth. He shows what an arbitrary and wooden kind of interpretation it is which extracts a promise of infallibility to a person, or to an assembly of bishops, or to any outward and visible organization among men, out of two or three texts conveying general promises of support and guidance to the society of Christ's followers. Such a method of interpretation fairly applied all round would lead to some such results as these.

"For first, we could, if we would, try it by lots whose doctrine is true and whose false; and you know it is written, 'The lot

[1] *Works* i. 78.

is cast into the lap; but the whole disposition of it is from the Lord.' We could refer them to the king, and you know it is written, 'A divine sentence is in the lips of the king; his mouth transgresseth not in judgement. The heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord.' We could refer the matter to any assembly of Christians assembled in the name of Christ, seeing it is written, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.' We may refer it to any priest, because it is written, 'The priest's lips shall preserve knowledge.' 'The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair,' &c. To any preacher of the gospel, to any pastor or doctor; for to every one of them Christ hath promised He 'will be with them always, even to the end of the world'; and of every one of them it is said, 'He that heareth you heareth Me,' &c. To any bishop or prelate; for it is written. 'Obey your prelates,' and again, 'He hath given pastors and doctors, &c., lest we should be carried about with every wind of doctrine.' To any particular Church of Christians, seeing it is a particular Church which is called 'the house of God, the pillar and ground of truth'; and seeing of any particular Church it is written, 'He that heareth not the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen or publican.' We might refer it to any man that prays for God's Spirit; for it is written, 'Every one that asketh receiveth'; and again, 'If any man want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth all men liberally, and upbraideth not.' . . . And if you say, These would fail us, and contradict themselves; so, as we pretend, have yours. There have been popes against popes; councils against councils; councils confirmed by popes against councils confirmed by popes; lastly, the Church of some ages against the Church of other ages"[1].

There are some modern advocates of Church authority in matters of belief who deny that even the whole Church, still less any particular branch of the Church, is infallible, and yet maintain that submission to an apostolically succeeded Church is always a duty and dissent always a sin. It is right for us to be Anglicans; but Italians and Spaniards must

[1] *Works* i. 315.

be Papists, and it is a sin to offer help or sympathy to foreign reformers of any sort. It may safely be said that no High-Churchman of the seventeenth century ever dreamed of thus postponing unity to truth, or making truth a mere matter of geography. The Church that imposes unlawful terms of communion itself becomes schismatical. "Not Protestants for rejecting but the Church of Rome for imposing upon the faith of Christians doctrines unwritten and unnecessary, and for disturbing the Church's peace, and dividing unity for such matters, is in a high degree presumptuous and schismatical"[1]. Strongly as Chillingworth felt the duty of subordinating minor matters of faith or practice to the demands of charity and unity (his own allegiance to the Church of England was based upon this principle), he felt that this very principle of union in essentials and liberty in unessentials dictated unity with continental Protestants in Englishmen rather than submission to Rome in Frenchmen. Chillingworth, though with his historical instinct and appreciation of the continuity of the Church he must have regretted the absence in the continental Churches of many features of organization and discipline which the Church of England had wisely retained, always writes as one who identified the cause of the Church of England with the cause of Protestantism. In the seventeenth century far higher Churchmen than Chillingworth were always ready to communicate (out of England) with non-episcopal Churches.

In ways like these the study of Chillingworth may still have its value for modern Churchmen: or, if I cannot sincerely say that I think the continuous reading of his work will be the best possible employment of time for very many, at all events it is well that the spirit of Chillingworth and some knowledge of his theological position should be diffused among us. It is well that we should realize how old and well-acknowledged is the position in the Church of England of a liberal party. For in all these questions of Church discipline and organization, in respect of the divisions between Churches and sects and creeds as they existed in his day, Chillingworth

[1] *Works* i. 33.

was a liberal. Would that the religious thought of our own day were always liberal to the same degree and after the same fashion! But in other matters it must be confessed that between the thought of Chillingworth and any that is possible at the present day there is a great gulf fixed. Chillingworth is liberal in his interpretation of biblical infallibility. When St Paul says that he only *thinks*, Chillingworth (unlike some orthodox modern commentators) is ready to take him at his word and admit that his advice, however valuable as advice, is fallible and not necessarily binding on Christians for all time. We hear nothing about verbal inspiration; the existence of dark and difficult places, no interpretation of which can be regarded as authoritative, is fully admitted. It is only when the meaning of Scripture is plain and unequivocal that it is to be taken as an absolutely infallible revelation of the mind of God: and even then there is no disposition to insist upon hard and literal interpretations of isolated passages. It is rather in the general tenour of Holy Scripture taken together that the infallible revelation is to be sought. But still there is the assumption that if a proposition can be fairly and squarely shown to be in the Bible—any part of it—it must be true. Chillingworth is willing enough to admit doubts and to tolerate differences as to what books do constitute canonical Scripture; but he never questions that there is (if it can only be discovered) a collection of books which are marked off from all other books in the world by the possession of this quality of infallibility. The critical study of the Bible, of other sacred writings, of history in general, does not allow of our following Chillingworth in these assumptions. It is curious how a mind so keenly alive to assumptions and confusions and illogicalities in other matters should so easily have been satisfied with the kind of argument upon which this stupendous doctrine apparently reposed. Because the very doubtful Second Epistle of St Peter says that all scripture is given by inspiration of God, therefore not only the historical truth but the doctrinal and ethical infallibility of the whole Old Testament is supernaturally guaranteed.

Because the Apostles were promised by our Lord and claimed for themselves some measure of divine assistance, therefore their teaching in all its parts is not only true but infallible. Because there are grounds from history and tradition for supposing that the books of the New Testament were written in good faith, and that they on the whole present us with a trustworthy picture of His teaching, therefore every word attributed to Christ by the Evangelists must certainly have been spoken by Him. How easily would such arguments have been blown to pieces had they been put forward by the Jesuit Knott in defence of the Roman Church! But the infallibility of Scripture was common ground between Chillingworth and Knott and all the men of their time except those to whom the Bible was simply a mass of dishonest forgeries, delusions, and superstitions on a level (to them) with the equally fraudulent and valueless sacred writings of other religions. The idea that Christianity might be the highest of all religions, the crown and culmination of revelation, rather than the one true religion among many false ones, that the Old Testament revelation might be the highest of many "praeparationes Evangelii," the idea that the Bible as a whole must be treated not as the only but as the greatest, most precious, most permanently valuable of all religious writings, and that it contains within itself many degrees and kinds of truth and of inspiration—these were ideas which were hidden from the wisest theologians of Chillingworth's day.

One other assumption of Chillingworth's may be briefly noticed. He is willing to extend the possibilities of salvation far and wide—widely enough to be very startling to the men of his own age. That God is the rewarder of all that diligently seek Him, that no one will be damned for intellectual error—certainly among Christians, probably among all who worship one God, perhaps even among all who seek even though they do not find—so much he strongly asserts. To all such will be given hereafter the truth which they have failed to attain here. But still there runs through his works a disposition to assume that after death there will be a hard

and fast distinction between the saved and the not-saved, and that salvation will be determined, if not by what men have believed, at least mainly and primarily by the earnestness and sincerity of their efforts to attain to a true religious creed. Perhaps sometimes his acquiescence in this assumption may be regarded as a merely provisional acceptance for purposes of controversy as against opponents who shared it. But it can hardly be said that Chillingworth had reached the idea of salvation as a purely moral state of which there may be degrees, or the belief that accuracy of religious belief is only valuable so far as it helps towards holiness of life. Perhaps in these days we are too apt to forget that, though not the only or the chief duty of man, the pursuit of truth with the resolution to live by it when found is a *part* of the task by faithful performance of which a man's character ought to be estimated by men and will assuredly be estimated by God.

Nobody ever sought for religious truth more earnestly or proclaimed it more fearlessly or followed it more disinterestedly than Chillingworth. We may take him as our model in that. The difficulties of our day are different from the difficulties of his, and yet they require to be faced in his spirit, though perhaps we should hardly wish that so large a share of the world's religious energy should now be devoted to speculative controversies. Still, it does want at least as much intellectual honesty and intellectual trouble to face the difficulties of faith in our day, and to make out, amid so many traditional beliefs that seem crumbling and breaking down around us, what may still be believed about God, about Immortality, about Christ the Great Revealer. If we brace ourselves to that task in the spirit of Chillingworth, each one according to the measure of his lights and his leisure and the needs of his own particular habit of mind, we shall still find, I believe, Protestantism in general, and the Church of England in particular, a "safe way of salvation," though our conception of Protestantism and our interpretation of the Church of England's formularies may be broader even than Chillingworth's; and though we shall more boldly and

confidently even than he decline to put beyond the pale of salvation those who have diligently sought God, though intellectually speaking they may not on earth have found Him: for in the highest of all senses we cannot say that any have altogether failed to find God in whose hearts there dwells any of that love which we believe to be the fullest revelation of His nature. "Forasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

IV

JAMES USHER

1581–1656

BY

E. W. WATSON, M.A.

RECTOR OF SUTTON BEDFORDSHIRE

JAMES USHER

THE great men who are the subjects of the present course of lectures have, with one exception, this common characteristic, that what is important in their work is directly connected with what is interesting in their life. The exception is Archbishop Usher. He stands in the first rank among scholars; he was an eager and skilful controversialist; he held the highest place in the Irish Church, and used his position with effect. But his controversial ardour lessened, and in some measure distorted, the results of his scholarly labours; and his ecclesiastical activity was unwise and contributed to disaster. His true life, that of the scholar at his desk, was naturally uneventful; naturally also, the facts which he discovered have become the common property of subsequent writers, while the learned volumes in which he published them, being interesting only for their contents, have grown obsolete with the progress of knowledge. We must, therefore, devote most of our attention to the public life which interrupted his studies; a life which has its importance in the history of the time, and illustrates in several aspects his country and his age. But we must also follow the progress of his mind as he emancipated himself from the narrow Calvinism of his education and approached the Anglican type of thought. It will be the study of an individual life and character. For Usher had no great capacities as a spiritual leader, and in spite of his massive knowledge he failed to leave his mark upon the Church's structure. Yet he will always be counted among the glories of our communion, for the greatness of his learning

and for the singular weight of his witness to the soundness of our Church's position.

No one could have had a more favourable start in life than he. James Usher was born in Dublin on January 4, 1581, of a prosperous official family, purely English in descent. His father and his mother's father were Masters in the Irish Court of Chancery. Two of his uncles were successively Archbishops of Armagh; two of his sisters subsequently married bishops. The Anglo-Irish who possessed education and could be trusted by the English Government were few in number, for the second tide of immigration from England had hardly begun to flow at the date of Usher's birth, and they were valued and encouraged by their rulers. Such promotion as the country afforded was certain to be offered them; Usher, it is true, would have risen to prominence in the wider field of England, but even he profited by the absence of rivals in his narrower arena. To this, as well as to his own merits, we must attribute his early success.

He was fortunate in being born at a time when it was possible for him to receive the education he deserved. For several centuries Ireland had been plunged in ignorance; but two talented Scotchmen, Fullerton and Hamilton, the latter the ancestor of the Marquis of Dufferin, were teaching a school in Dublin during his boyhood. They were unofficial diplomatists, employed to promote the interests of King James of Scotland, the natural heir to the thrones of England and Ireland, whom his cousin, Queen Elizabeth, refused to recognize as her successor. Their position, in the face of the Queen's jealousy and suspicion, was delicate and even dangerous; and they concealed their mission by acting, and with great success, the part of schoolmasters. To their charge Usher was entrusted in his ninth year, in 1589, and acquired knowledge so rapidly that he was deemed fit to enter Trinity College, Dublin, when it was opened at the beginning of 1594. The College owed its existence in great measure to the perseverance, in the face of many disappointments, of his own uncles; and though the Usher family could well have afforded to send him to one of the old Universities, it was natural that pride

in the College they had helped to create should lead them to enter him at Trinity. They must have felt that they were making a certain sacrifice of his interests to those of a struggling institution, for the College was founded on a modest scale, with little thought of its growing into a great University. But, as things turned out, they could not have chosen more happily, for him and for it. Trinity College probably stands alone in having received the greatest scholar it has trained among those who first entered its doors. His two teachers, Fullerton and Hamilton, joined the College at the same time as members of the small company of five original Fellows.

We must now consider the teaching given in Trinity, for it had a decisive influence upon Usher's life. From his childhood he had been in contact with Romanism. His family was strangely divided in belief; if two of his uncles were Archbishops of the Irish Church, another was a Jesuit, and his mother, after her husband's death, joined the Roman communion. It was impossible for him to be neutral or indifferent; he must inevitably be strongly attracted, or violently repelled, by Rome. The latter was the case with Usher, and Trinity fixed for him the form which his opposition was to take. It was that of Calvinism. For though the English Reformers had been at first under Lutheran influence, causes both political and theological soon turned the scale in favour of the doctrines of Calvin. Lutheranism was not impressive as a system of thought, and it had little opportunity of making itself known in England. Not only was Scotland Calvinist, but a screen of Calvinist states and parties, from the Channel to the Alps, cut off England from connexion with the Lutheran portion of Germany. Holland, the Huguenots of France, the Palatinate, Geneva, the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland, presented the Reformation in its Calvinist form. It was they who bore the brunt of the Roman attack and set the pattern of a logical and consistent Protestantism. The generations of Elizabeth and James I had them for their models of heroism and piety; and when we remember the long conflicts waged, against what seemed hopeless odds, by the Dutch and the Genevese, we cannot wonder

that their doctrines seemed true to those who marvelled at the courage they could inspire. It was essentially a fighting creed; to avow Calvinism was to nail the colours to the mast. And it was essentially intolerant. If it offered no terms to Rome, it was equally uncompromising towards Lutheranism. From the Reformation to the French Revolution no Lutheran could be a citizen of Geneva; and, as a sign of the exasperation caused in the milder spirit of Lutheranism by such hostility, we may note that the Lutheran Elector of Saxony in 1601 beheaded his Chancellor for the crime of "Cryptocalvinism." Such was the teaching to which Usher was subjected from his childhood. His Scottish masters had been trained in the strictest doctrines of Glasgow; and when he passed with them to the University he found in the Head of his College the most famous of English Presbyterians. Travers, the opponent of Hooker, was the first Provost of Trinity. Elizabeth was surrounded by statesmen and courtiers who had no sympathy with her Anglicanism. She would not allow them to work their will upon the English Church; but Ireland counted for little. Men who were denied promotion in England were permitted to find a provision there, and Burghley seized the opportunity which the foundation of Trinity gave him to provide for Travers. Thus the boy of fourteen was plunged into Calvinism and controversy. For the College had been founded to provide Ireland with clergy, and argument was the chief duty of the clergy in those times. The learning taught at Trinity was either directly or indirectly theological; facts were not valued for their own sake, but as weapons which, if carefully chosen, would reduce an opponent to silence. The mischief to mere boys, such as the students were, of perverting their education into an engine for making partisans must have been lamentable. Nothing shows Usher's real greatness more clearly than the fact that, in spite of this training and in spite of the prejudices, fatal to his usefulness as Primate, with which it imbued him, he was through life unwearied and dispassionate in the search for historical truth.

His career at the University was brilliant. At nineteen he became a Fellow of Trinity, having already had a con-

troversy with a Jesuit, and was at once put upon the teaching staff of the College and appointed a preacher—such was the lack of educated divines—at Christ Church Cathedral in Dublin. At Advent, 1601, a fortnight before his twenty-first birthday, he was ordained deacon and priest on the same day by his uncle, Henry Usher, Archbishop of Armagh. When he was about twenty-four he received the well-endowed post of Chancellor of St Patrick's Cathedral, and apparently resigned his fellowship. But at twenty-seven he renewed his connexion with the University, being appointed to the position afterwards known as the Regius Professorship of Divinity, but then, very characteristically, as the Professorship of Theological Controversies. He had already paid two visits to England, in search of books for the library of his College, and had made the acquaintance of some of the great English scholars. On his third visit, in 1609, the young Professor was summoned to the Court of James I, who had heard of his erudition from Archbishop Bancroft, and graciously received. In this year the Provostship of Trinity was offered him, and declined ; in the next, at thirty, he took his Doctor's degree in Divinity. And, to conclude this career of early success, four years later he married his cousin Phoebe Challoner, an heiress with a handsome fortune, whose father had lately died, "enjoining her not to marry any person but Dr Usher, if he should propose himself."

The position of a great man in a small society must always be perilous to character. Trinity College was young and had no reputation as yet; no doubt the most was made of him. But though the College fixed for him his principles and involved him (very willingly on his own part) in the Roman controversy, it did not spoil him. His sense of the greatness of the field of knowledge and of the seriousness of the scholar's life saved him from vanity and contentedness in cheaply won triumphs. But that controversy, in the form which it took for him, unhappily led Usher, in his first important work, to cast the results of his reading into the worst possible shape. When, as a boy of eighteen, he entered the lists with the Jesuit Fitzsymons, the argument

from antiquity was brought against him. It is said that he used the next eighteen years in reading through Patristic literature in search of evidence to refute Rome's claim to the past. He read much, during those years, beside the Fathers; and if he read them for partisan purposes, he drew from them a store of knowledge of infinitely greater value than the controversial. But, as a controversialist, he had to use his knowledge; and he had to frame a theory which should render his array of facts intelligible. The Romanists had their theory, that of historical continuity. We, of course, make the same claim, recognizing that our position is baseless and meaningless without it. But Usher abandoned it; he accepted without suspicion the current explanation of the Apocalypse as containing a prophecy of Antichristian Rome, and he had been brought up among men who had no reverence for the Church as a society possessing, whatever its faults, a venerable and sacred history. Hence, instead of the true line of development, he traced, with wonderful erudition and ingenuity, a broken line of protests against the historical Western Church. These protests were intermittent and inconsistent, often ambiguous and often of dubious orthodoxy; but he had to make the best of them. The result, it must be confessed, was a failure; antiquarianism, however learned, is no match for history, however perverted. But the massive learning and the whole-hearted earnestness displayed in Usher's first great work, the *De continua successione et statu ecclesiae*, published in 1613, gained for it an immediate success and a permanent influence. If there are still quarters in which the spiritual ancestry of the English Church is sought among Albigenses and Waldenses, Usher is chiefly responsible for that strange distortion of history.

But this controversial work, honest and laborious as it was, represents only one side of his activity. Most of this was coloured by antipathy to Rome, but it led him far beyond that barren region where momentary fame was the only reward to be gained. His eager speculation concerning the enigmas of Daniel and of the Apocalypse plunged him into mathematics. The "new and admirable logarithms"

of Napier, just discovered, excite his enthusiasm. Dates must be fixed, and so he calculates eclipses and solar years, taking his share in those chronological toils for which we, who have entered into their labours, are not sufficiently grateful to the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even as a boy he had attempted to fix the dates of Old Testament events, and he continued to labour at the subject throughout his life. In his seventieth year, in 1650, he published the chronology from the Creation till the rise of the Maccabees; four years later, his second volume carried on the record to the final destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. His life was cut short before he could complete his task by continuing the history up to the Councils of the Fourth Century. It is impossible to overvalue the diligence and acuteness of reasoning to which these volumes, the work of a lifetime, testify. For several generations his conclusions were accepted as authoritative throughout the Protestant world; and to this day we may read in our Reference Bibles the dates which Usher assigned to the Creation and the Deluge as well as to later events. It is not to his discredit that many of his *data* can no longer be accepted as historical, and that the modern discovery of the primitive records of the East and the more careful examination of the documents of later ages have rendered his Annals obsolete. But he was no mere chronologer. Interest in the sacred text led him on to the study of the Eastern versions of the Bible. Syriac and Samaritan, Coptic and Arabic were familiar to him. But the confession must be made that in his later years he came seriously to undervalue the knowledge he had acquired at no small cost of money and labour. The Septuagint, he wrongly thought, was of little service for the explanation of the Hebrew, and much study of the Eastern tongues a loss of time. But he was not content with these wide fields of research. Celtic antiquities, the beginnings of English Christianity, the history of the so-called Dark Ages, medieval charters and records, shared his attention. In those days, when libraries were uncatalogued, when countless manuscripts were in the market

and many ancient works were as yet unprinted, the scholar might discover a prize at any moment. He read, therefore, through everything, though few scholars kept and digested notes on so many subjects as Usher. But if there was more to excite the student's hope then than now, this advantage was counterbalanced by the necessity under which he lay of wading through an infinity of literature, written and printed, as dreary and worthless as the *Sibrandus Schafnaburgensis*, in whom Browning has typified it. Usher did not flinch from the task. His voluminous correspondence shows both his diligence in seeking for books and his accuracy in verifying his facts. It is impossible, for this reason, to fix dates for his literary life. He was simultaneously engaged in every one of his inquiries, and the magnificent series of works which he published in exile and old age had been in preparation throughout his career. Long before he had won fame as a writer, he had been recognized by English scholars. There may have been at first a touch of patronage in their welcome to the representative of the new Irish University. But Selden and Savile and Camden and Cotton soon regarded him as their equal, and he had some correspondence, at least through common friends, with Isaac Casaubon, the greatest scholar of the age, who died in the year of Usher's marriage. But he was more than a student and the companion of students; he had the rare gift of promoting study in others. From his twenty-seventh year onwards we find him advising and encouraging the scholars of Cambridge, a University to which he was strongly attached.

We must now return to his public life, which does not merit an equal praise. In 1615, for the first time since the Reformation, a Convocation assembled in Dublin. The Irish Church had no constitution. Such attempts as had been made to introduce order into its confusion had been by Acts of Parliament, proclamations of the Lord Deputy, meetings of bishops, and other anomalous methods. The Church had no Articles of Belief and no Canons. For the present, it was determined to confine legislation to the former

need. The task of drawing up a body of Articles was confided, very naturally, to Usher as Professor of Divinity and a theologian of note. He acted with grotesque unwisdom. The English Church was contented with thirty-nine; he produced a collection of one hundred and four. England had decisively rejected the Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles; Usher inserted their teaching and made it even more drastic. He definitely asserted that the Pope is Antichrist; no doubt many in England had held this as an opinion, but they had wisely and deliberately refrained from stating it as a doctrine. King James had lately issued his *Book of Sports*; the Article on the Lord's Day was a reproof to him. Some of the Articles, like that on the Service of God, were rambling and homiletical, entirely unsuited for insertion in such a code. But most remarkable of all was the complete silence concerning the principles of Church government. Such as they were, the Articles were accepted by Convocation, which passed a decree that any minister preaching contrary to them should be silenced and deprived. They did not, however, receive the confirmation of Parliament.

It was a serious error. The Articles alienated the sympathies of the rising school in England, and did nothing to strengthen the Church in Ireland. They seemed to commit it irrevocably to Calvinism, and to stamp their author as a partisan of his teachers, Travers and Hamilton. He had been well received at Court, and, according to all the precedents of the time, must have been expecting promotion. But his Church policy overcast his prospects, and for several years he remained in the shade. He paid no visit to England, where he must have known that he would not be welcomed. But his Irish friends were eager to promote his interests, and his learning constituted a claim which at that time was almost irresistible. True learning was rare, and was admired in a way that we can hardly understand. It had all the attraction of novelty, for it had only come into being, as a substitute for medieval scholasticism, within the last few generations. A great scholar was as famous then as a great scientific discoverer now. James I, it is true, was a pedant,

but the least pedantic of kings, Henry IV of France, was equally a patron of learning. When Casaubon left the French Court for the English, his importance was regarded as such that the rival claims to his services became almost an international question; and Cromwell, as we shall see, honoured and supported Usher in his last years. The one bar to his rise was his Calvinism, and his friends exerted themselves to dispel the prejudice it had created. They adopted a plan which seems strange to us. In 1619 he received a testimonial from the Irish to the English Privy Council of his fitness to be made a bishop. They confess that his reputation has injured him, but, they say, "we are desirous to set him right in his Majesty's opinion, who it seems has been informed that he is somewhat transported with singularities and unaptness to be conformable to the rules and orders of the Church. We are so far from suspecting him in that kind that we may boldly recommend him to your lordships, as a man orthodox and worthy to govern in the Church when occasion shall be presented and his Majesty may be pleased to advance him." Armed with this testimonial he went to England, and spent there the better part of two years, dividing his time between the libraries and the Court, where he was again received into favour. In 1621 the see of Meath fell vacant, and he was appointed.

We must now glance at the Irish Church, in which he was henceforth to play a prominent part. Its condition was desperate. Most of its buildings were in ruins, or almost ruinous; few of its clergy were resident, for the endowments had in countless instances been seized by the landlords, and one man had to eke out his existence by holding several benefices. The bishops, whose appointment had been secured by the landlords, entered into the conspiracy. The majority of them devoted their energy to robbing their sees for the benefit of their families; Irish titles have often been endowed out of the plunder of the Church. Usher knew all this, and the cleanness of his own hands as a bishop showed that he condemned it. But the Calvinism which the spoilers

professed outweighed their misdeeds in his judgement, and made him their partisan. For Calvinism, admirable as its effects have been upon the character and intellect of the middle classes, has often shown itself curiously complaisant towards wickedness in high places. The ignoble adventurers who plundered England in the name of Edward VI, the turbulent and unprincipled aristocracy of France, the merciless and treacherous nobles of Scotland, with all these Calvinism worked in friendly alliance. So it was in Ireland. Its Protestant rulers tyrannized over the Celtic population, and robbed their Church with as few scruples as they robbed the natives. To confirm the Church in Calvinism, of which these men were ostentatious advocates, was to lessen the hope of such good government as could only come from England, and from that section in England which had least sympathy with Calvinism; and it was to identify the plundered Church, in the eyes of the natives, with the cause of the plunderers. When the day of reckoning came, in 1641, in massacres compared to which those of the Indian Mutiny were insignificant, the Church had its full share in the hatred which then found satisfaction, for the Church had publicly cast in its lot with those who were its spoilers as well as those of the native Irish.

In times of such exasperation a strong man would probably have failed to avert disaster; a wise man would at least have striven for peace. Usher was not strong in his dealings with other men. A friend speaks of his "extraordinary meek and mild carriage." It was the sign of weakness. He displayed neither administrative ability nor firmness of character, nor even continuous interest in the duties of his office. In fact, he seems to have felt that his episcopate was a failure, and to have tried to forget the disappointment in his library. But he did display that violence of speech which often accompanies weakness in action, and so far as he had an effect upon the history of his time, it was for evil. Dr Elrington, his editor, tells us, with all the authority of a Regius Professor of Divinity, that a great scholar can never be a good bishop. The generation which has known

Lightfoot, to name but one, cannot accept the *dictum*; but Usher weighs heavily in the other scale.

He began his work as bishop with great energy, preaching throughout his diocese controversial sermons against Romanism. Much curiosity was excited and crowds gathered to listen. But there was little result, and he soon abandoned the attempt, and withdrew to his books. His failure embittered him; the only remedy, he came to think, lay in repression. He soon had an opportunity of urging it. In the second year of his episcopate a new Lord Deputy arrived in Dublin, and Usher preached before him a violent sermon on the text "He beareth not the sword in vain." The sermon caused much excitement, and drew down upon Usher a severe and merited rebuke from the Primate, Hampton of Armagh. "If my wishes may take place, seeing so many men of quality have something against you, tarry not till they complain, but prevent it by a voluntary retractation and milder interpretation of the points offensive, and especially of drawing the sword, of which spirit we are not nor ought to be; for our weapons are not carnal but spiritual. Withal it will not be amiss, in mine opinion, for your lordship to withdraw yourself from those parts (Dublin) and to spend more time in your own diocese, that such as will not hear your doctrine may be drawn to love and reverence for your lordship for your hospitality and conversation."

These unpleasant events may have been the reason for Usher's departure to England next year. He obtained an unlimited leave of absence from the Irish Privy Council, of which he was a member, and on reaching England was charged by the king to "collect the antiquities of the British Church before and since the Christian faith was received by the English nation," and commanded to reside for the purpose at Oxford or Cambridge. The work was not published till 1639, for now, as always, Usher was simultaneously engaged in many inquiries, and during this visit to England published the brightest and most readable of his books, the *Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit.* It is not a work of the laborious erudition we should have expected from him, but

a popular discussion of the usual points of controversy. It has more literary merit than most books of the kind, and is worthy of the greatness of its theme. For Usher deals with it as a directly religious issue, and moves on a plane of thought infinitely higher than that of the disquisitions on antiquarian points and subtleties of the canon law which are now in vogue in this debate.

When James I was on his deathbed, at the beginning of 1625, Primate Hampton died and Usher was appointed to take his place at Armagh. He remained for more than a year in England, returning to Ireland in August, 1626. Most of his time was now spent in Dublin, for the Archbishop had to attend the Council and to take an important share in the administration of the country. But he seems to have visited Drogheda, his residence, fairly often; and if we are disposed to blame him for neglect of his diocese, we must remember both the customs of the time and the smallness of the Irish sees. Andrewes, when Bishop of Ely, resided there three months in the year, and the old diocese of Ely, small as it was, contained more parishes than Meath or Armagh. Usher's policy towards the Roman Catholics was as unwise as ever. King Charles, sorely in want of money, attempted in 1626 to get a grant from Ireland by a promise of toleration for the majority. Armagh and eleven other prelates—seven, including the Archbishop of Dublin, did not sign it—issued a violent protest. "It is to make ourselves accessory not only to their superstitious idolatries and heresies, and in a word to all the abominations of Popery, but also (which is a consequent of the former) to the perdition of the seduced people which perish in the deluge of the Catholic apostasy," may serve as a sample of their language. And this was from the heads of a Church which existed on sufferance, and at a time when the patience of the Irish was almost exhausted. Elizabeth would not, James and Charles could not, keep up a force sufficient to maintain the Government and the Church as then established. Such words as these must have had their share in hastening the catastrophe of 1641; it was as impolitic to use them then as it was

ungenerous to repeat them after Cromwell and William III had crushed the Irish insurrection. Usher's conduct was the more deplorable that at this very time the attempt was being made to win the Irish by providing them with the Bible and the services of the Church in their own language. It was probably too late, for the Church was irrevocably committed, in the eyes of the people, to the cause of her oppressors and theirs. But it has conferred a well-earned immortality upon the name of Bishop Bedell of Kilmore, its author; and Usher's opposition to the scheme is one of the most glaring proofs of his unwisdom. Though he insisted that the Church should not be English, he insisted also that it should not, in any effectual sense, be Irish; and the difficulties which he cast in the way of Bedell were among the chief causes which denied a fair trial to his experiment.

In 1634, when Strafford was Lord Deputy, another Convocation was summoned. Strafford was determined that the Church should have fair treatment; but he was equally resolved that it should conform to English standards. He forced the Convocation to accept the Thirty-nine Articles, sorely against Usher's will. The Irish code was not revoked, though Strafford and those who thought with him regarded it as superseded. But Usher and some of his colleagues would not abandon their handiwork of 1615, and insisted upon the signature by candidates for Orders of both series of Articles; probably the most voluminous test of orthodoxy which has ever been imposed. Rebellion, however, soon caused ordinations to cease, and in 1660 the Irish Articles were quietly consigned to oblivion. The Church had now its definitive statement of doctrine; it remained to supply it with canons. Strafford was for the adoption of the English; Usher again in opposition. A compromise was arranged, by which the English canons were retained in substance though altered in form, the number being reduced to one hundred. This revision was the work of Bishop Bramhall of Derry, a Churchman of the Anglican type, and was only in form a victory for Usher, whose sympathies were not, as we have seen, with that school. Nor did it conduce to the welfare of the Irish Church, for it

alienated the rising force of Ulster Presbyterianism, where even now, after two centuries of discouragement and emigration, the Presbyterians outnumber the Churchmen.

Usher, indeed, was still, and continued during his Irish days to be, the disciple of Travers. When Strafford visited him at Drogheda he found the palace chapel arranged in Presbyterian fashion; and Usher maintained a copious correspondence on points of high Calvinism with his Cambridge friends. But though, if he had had a strong will or a free hand in the Convocation of 1634, he would probably have shown his sympathy with the men of Ulster, we must remember that he had had no experience of Presbyterianism as a working system, and that, as the kinsman of many bishops and as a divine who must have expected, from an early age, that he would be raised to the episcopate, he was naturally drawn towards our own method of Church government. His position, indeed, must at this time have resembled that of Casaubon; both had a preference, though nothing more than a preference, for the English type, rather than for the Continental, of reformed Christianity. Usher's silence in the Articles of 1615 concerning Church principles is far more significant than his silent acceptance in 1634 of Bramhall's Canons. But his mind was working, though slowly, and we shall soon see the effect of his studies upon his convictions.

It was as Archbishop that he was first able to satisfy his passion for books as well as for their contents. While still a very young man, before he became professor, we are told that "for books he had a kind of laudable covetousness, and never thought a good book, either MS. or print, too dear." He had repeatedly been entrusted with money for the purchase of books on behalf of Trinity College, and, as he had never been a poor man, he had been able to buy freely for himself. But he used his high position to take rank by the side of Laud as a rival of the great lay collectors, Cotton and Bodley. Laud's chief successes were won through the agents whom he employed in Germany to purchase the plunder collected by Protestant armies from the libraries of cathedrals and monasteries sacked

during the Thirty Years' War. Usher devoted himself to the East, whence his agents at Aleppo and Constantinople sent him valuable manuscripts in many of the Oriental languages. He was as generous as Laud. Not only did he enrich the library of his own College, but also, through gifts to Laud and Cotton, those of Oxford and of the British Museum, of which Cotton's collections were the germ. His princely liberality in this respect is one of his worthiest titles to fame.

We may now leave his career in Ireland, which contains no more events of importance. In 1640 he was summoned by King Charles, whose troubles had come to a head, to give his counsel concerning Church affairs. He must have seemed well suited for a mediator. On the one hand, he was a strong, and even extreme, loyalist; on the other, his affinities with Presbyterianism were well known, and it might be expected that the Puritans would welcome his suggestions. But nothing came of his efforts. Though he was willing to modify the government of the Church, he would have no changes in the Liturgy; and when the Puritans, as a signal mark of their confidence, offered him a seat in the Westminster Assembly, he refused to sanction it by his presence. Thus he lost his influence with the one party, while his counsels to the other were such as could only be welcomed as a last resource. For his scheme was that of a "modified episcopacy," which would, by a different process, have reduced the bishop to the position which he now holds in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. As in the Scottish dioceses administered by the saintly Leighton, a gradation of courts, in which the clergy confined the bishop to the office of president, would have given an oligarchical and purely clerical constitution to the Church, which would still have been able, as retaining the "primitive and scriptural" office of the bishop, to claim continuity with the past. This last point had now its due weight with Usher. He would not, as in 1615, have omitted it in a statement of the character of the Church. He had read more and come to firmer conclusions. But his early training led him to minimize what he would not abandon; and as a scholar he could distinguish between the essential

and the accidental attributes of the office. It was primitive, and he wished it to revert to its primitive condition. If the administrative powers, necessarily concentrated in the bishop's hands in ancient times of persecution, were withdrawn ; if the dignity of high civil rank in which the Roman Empire, after its conversion, had clothed him, and the feudal rights with which the Middle Ages had invested him were also removed ; if the functions, numerous even then though far more numerous now, with which Parliaments or other secular authorities had charged him were entrusted to other hands, then there would remain the primitive work and *status* of the bishop. There was historical truth in the plea, but history should have taught Usher that development is the law of society, and that artificial reversion to an abandoned type must end in failure. And, as the course of events soon showed, the union he attempted to effect was not that which was necessary for immediate peace. It was not Presbyterianism, but a conventional, cosmopolitan Protestantism that was to have its moment of triumph under Cromwell; and compromise with it would have been fraught with worse disaster to the Church than that which actually befell. Its national and historical character would have been obscured or lost. But Usher was not alone either in his miscalculation of the forces at work or in his belief in the efficacy of his suggestion. King Charles resorted to it, in the lowest depth of his troubles, in 1648, and it had its influence over the Declaration of Breda in 1660, while the futile negotiations for union between the Church and the Dissenters which followed the Restoration were based in the main on Usher's scheme.

But we must return to his personal history. He had come to England in 1640 ; the next year was that of the Irish rebellion and massacres, which barred his return and swept away his income. His needs were relieved by his promotion in 1642 to the see of Carlisle, to be held with that of Armagh. He never visited his new diocese, from which he was cut off by the Civil War within a year, having only enjoyed its revenues for that space. He was a strong Royalist, and had the confidence of the king and of Laud, with whom he had

held for twelve years a correspondence which was managed by Laud with great tact, in the avoidance of their points of difference. He was one of the prelates consulted by Charles as to the lawfulness of consenting to the death of Strafford, and advised against it; he carried the king's last message to the earl, whose confession he heard, and whom he accompanied on the scaffold. When the war broke out, he joined the king at Oxford, but he was eager for his true work, and soon sought peace, first in the west and afterwards in London. Homeless as he was and hampered by the loss of books, he published in 1644 the volume which is the most striking evidence of his critical genius, his edition of St Ignatius of Antioch. At London he found shelter with the Countess of Peterborough, whose husband he had won from Romanism twenty years before. In 1647 he was appointed Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, a post whose duties he regularly fulfilled until his last illness. We must not regard his acceptance as an abandonment of his principles. Cromwell was a strong ruler, but neither in Church nor State was there consistent principle, and under that peaceful anarchy other prominent Churchmen besides Usher found preferment. Thomas Fuller, for instance, the author of the *Worthies*, had been ejected from a Dorset benefice, but was admitted to the important vicarage of Waltham Abbey. But Cromwell was not content merely to allow Usher the opportunity of earning his bread. He honoured learning as sincerely as King James had done, and raised the great scholar above the fear of want by the annual pension, princely for those times, of £400. For eight years more, in comfort and amid universal respect, Usher laboured on with indefatigable industry, issuing from the press the results of his lifelong researches, and still, in spite of his years, collecting material for future works. But soon after he had completed his seventy-fifth year his health broke down, and after a short illness he died at Reigate, in the house of his faithful friend the Countess of Peterborough, on March 21, 1656. By the Protector's orders he received the honour of a public funeral in Westminster Abbey.

It was the end of a life singularly successful both in work

accomplished and in honour won from every side. No honour, indeed, could be too high for one who, in spite of all the temptations to partisanship which his education and surroundings, his public position and the stormy age in which he lived, subjected him, strove so patiently and sincerely to ascertain and to co-ordinate the facts of history. He made, no doubt, many mistakes, for he was working an almost virgin soil, and in a field too wide for the compass of one mind; and often enough his judgement was distorted by prejudice. But his failures weigh lightly against his achievements; and his honesty of purpose was rewarded, as his knowledge grew, with increasing freedom and insight. His outward circumstances, his likes and dislikes, might master him at times, but they were never allowed to usurp a controlling influence over his thoughts and studies. While he held the great position of Primate of the Irish Church and enjoyed the friendship and confidence of Laud, he showed himself singularly insensible of the attraction of theories which would have magnified his office, and adhered undoubtingly to that Calvinistic doctrine of which Laud was the most conspicuous opponent. His personal interests could not tempt him to abandon the teaching of his youth. But in later life, with nothing to hope or to fear, he advanced to the conviction that what he had once rejected was doctrinally and historically true. Not that the school of Laud, or any other, could claim him without reserve as its adherent. His very independence adds to the impressiveness of his testimony. In the fullness of knowledge, with judgement trained and ripened character, he found that the type of Christianity with which we are familiar, the wide charity and immemorial order of the English Church, was that in which his reason and his affections could rest.

V

JOHN BRAMHALL

1594–1663

BY

WILLIAM EDWARD COLLINS, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

JOHN BRAMHALL

THE life and work of John Bramhall[1] derive a special importance from the fact that he bridges over the great period of upheaval between the outbreak of the Civil War and the Restoration of Charles II, when Church and State were alike in a state of chaos. Others were more important than he at the beginning of the period, Laud and Williams and Usher, but they were dead before the end. Others were as important after the Restoration was an accomplished fact, Sheldon and Pearson, Cosin and Jeremy Taylor; but they were comparatively speaking unknown men before the upheaval began. Nobody covers the whole of the period as he does; for although there were not a few[2] who were bishops

[1] The chief authorities for the life of Archbishop Bramhall are (a) *Manuscript*: letters in the Record Office, the British Museum, and Lambeth Library. (b) *Printed*: Vesey's *Athanasius Hibernicus, or the Life of the most reverend Father in God John Lord Archbishop of Ardmagh*, prefixed to Bramhall's *Works*, Dublin, 1676 and 1677; Bramhall's *Works*, edited by A. W. Haddan, with a life and supplementary notes (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 5 vols.); the *Rawdon Papers*; the *Strafford Letters*; Laud's *Letters*; Bp Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland*, vol. i; and W. Ball Wright, *A Great Yorkshire Divine of the Seventeenth Century* (York, 1899). Dr Wm. Fuller, Bishop of Limerick and afterwards of Lincoln, had designed to write the life of Bramhall, and made collections for the purpose; but his death put an end to the project (Vesey, *Life*, and Wood, *Athenae*, ed. Bliss, iv. 850). The life in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is wholly unworthy of its subject.

[2] Nine in England, William Juxon, bishop of London 1633, archbishop of Canterbury 1660–63; Brian Duppa, Chichester 1638, Sarum 1641, Winchester 1660–62; Matthew Wren, Hereford 1635, Norwich 1635, Ely 1638–67; Accepted Frewen, Lichfield 1644, York 1660–64; William Piers, Peterborough 1630, Bath and Wells 1632–70; Henry King, Chichester 1642–1669; John Warner, Rochester 1638–66; Robert Skinner, Bristol 1637, Oxford 1641, Worcester 1663–70; and William Roberts, Bangor 1637–65. In Ireland,

at its beginning and who survived at or long after its close, they were worn out with age and infirmities, and took little part in public affairs. Bramhall alone was a power both before and after the troubles, and, it may be added, during their whole course. As Bishop of Derry, he was a strenuous upholder of the Laudian reformation and one of Strafford's most trusted lieutenants in the government of Ireland; as an exile on the continent, he was one of the chiefest champions of "this poor persecuted Church of England" during the time of her adversity; after the Restoration, as Archbishop of Armagh, he bore the brunt of the settlement of the Irish Church, having meanwhile grown largely in wisdom, in charity, and in tenderness for the scruples of others, but without having abated a jot of his strenuous churchmanship.

I

John Bramhall was born in 1594[1] at Pontefract, of an old Cheshire family, one branch of which had settled in Yorkshire[2]. At the age of fourteen he proceeded to Sidney College at Cambridge[3], where he took his degrees in due course, and laid the foundations of that theological learning which stood him in such good stead in later life. Of these days he long

seven besides Bramhall: Thomas Fulwar, bishop of Ardfert 1641, Archbishop of Cashel 166$\frac{0}{1}$-67; Griffith Williams, Ossory 1641-72; Henry Jones, Clogher 1645, Meath 1661-81; Robert Maxwell, Kilmore 1643-72; Henry Leslie, Down and Connor 1635, Meath 166$\frac{0}{1}$-64; William Bayly, Clonfert 1644-64; and John Leslie, Raphoe 1633, Clogher 1661-71.

[1] The exact date is unknown. It was later than May 14, for Laud, writing on May 14, 1634 to Strafford, says that he has recommended Bramhall to the king for the bishopric of Derry, though "a little too young"; i. e. still under the age of forty (Laud, *Works* vi. 375, cf. 322). And it was not later than Nov. 18, on which day he was baptized, as appears from the registers of St. Giles', Pontefract (W. Ball Wright, *A Great Yorkshire Divine of the Seventeenth Century* 4).

[2] See the interesting paper by Mr Wright above referred to, where Bramhall's family history is carefully worked out. Mr Wright has most kindly furnished me with an annotated copy, containing the results of later investigations, which I have made use of below.

[3] His tutor was Richard Howlet, who afterwards became Dean of Cork through his influence. Howlet was also tutor to Oliver Cromwell: Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, ii. 153, note 9; Laud, *Works* iv. 5.

afterwards wrote: "When I was a young student in theology, Dr Ward[1] declared his mind unto me to this purpose, that it was impossible that the present controversies of the Church should be rightly determined or reconciled, without a deep insight into the doctrine of the primitive Fathers, and a competent skill in school theology. The former affordeth us a right pattern, and the second smootheth it over and planeth away the knots"[2]. He returned to Yorkshire in 1615, and was ordained by Archbishop Toby Matthew, becoming in succession curate and rector of St Martin-cum-Gregory at York, rector of South Kilvington near Thirsk, Prebendary of Ripon, Master of St John's Hospital at Ripon, and Prebendary of York[3]. Meanwhile, his powers were gradually becoming known. In 1623 or 1624, whilst at South Kilvington, he had two public disputations at Northallerton with a Jesuit named Hungate and a secular priest named Houghton[4], who had put forth a public defiance against all the English clergy of the neighbourhood. When nobody else came forward, Bramhall took up the challenge, and entirely overwhelmed his opponents. In the words of his earliest biographer: "Mr *Bramhall* not enduring to see his Brethren so dispirited, while these *Goliah's* were blaspheming the Armies of the Living God, as inspired with a great zeal and indignation, undertook the Combat. He was then but a Stripling in the School of Controversie, in which they had spent as many years possibly as he had in the World, being but thirty yeares of age, yet he managed

[1] Master of Sidney from 1609 to 1643, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity from 1621, and Archdeacon of Taunton. He was in frequent correspondence with Usher.

[2] In the *Vindication of Grotius and Episcopalians from Popery* (*Works* iii. 568).

[3] He married, on Nov. 10, 1618, Elizabeth, daughter of William Halley, Town Clerk of York 1603–13, and widow of a clergyman named Collingwood (see Wright, p. 7).

[4] Neither of these persons is noticed in Gillow's *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics*, though the Hungates were a well-known Yorkshire family. Perhaps however Bramhall's opponents cannot be considered as definitely determined: Dudley Loftus, in his funeral sermon on the Archbishop, says that he disputed "contra tres Jesuitas" (*Oratio funebris habita post exuvias . . . Johannis Archiepiscopi Armachani*, Dublin, 1673, p. 3). So also Jeremy Taylor in his *Funeral Sermon* (given in Bramhall, *Works* I. lviii).

both the shield and the sword with that dexterity, that his *Antagonists* and the whole party that stood with them, had reason to repent of the insolence of their adventure"[1].

This brought him to the further notice of Archbishop Matthew, who "gave him a Rebuke for his hardines, in undertaking a disputation so publickly, without allowance," but soon forgave him, and made him his chaplain.

At Ripon too, where he was chosen to be Sub-Dean, he soon attained a great influence. "He showed his exceeding great love to his flock, which they were very sensible of, in staying among them in a time of a most contagious and destructive Pestilence. He could not be persuaded to desert them or his duty, but would visit them in their greatest necessity and danger, going into their infected Houses to baptize their children, and do other offices of his Ministry." His knowledge of law[2] ("the common and statute Laws, as well as civill and Canon") was such that he was frequently chosen as arbiter to settle disputes; and his influence in public affairs was so great that "even into the Elections of members for the Parliament such as he named at *Rippon* and other corporations" carried "the vote and favor of the people"[3]. Thus Bramhall seemed in every way marked out for a successful career in England: he had been appointed to the High Commission, and was proposed as chaplain in ordinary to Charles I, when the call came which determined the whole course of his future life. In 1633 he was invited by Wentworth, afterwards the great Earl of Strafford (who, in his capacity of Lord President of the North, was acquainted with

[1] *Athanasius Hibernicus: or the Life of the Most Reverend Father in God John Lord Archbishop of Ardmagh*, by John Vesey, Bishop of Limerick. The life, which is not paged, is prefixed to Vesey's edition of Bramhall's *Works*. It gives particulars of the disputation.

[2] The Irish Convocation of 1661 spoke of him as "edoctus non minus e Sacris Literis quam Decretalibus Gregorii Epistolis et Sexto" (Bramhall, *Works* I. cxv).

[3] Some sign of this influence of Bramhall's may be seen in the fact that no less than fifty-two landowners within the liberties of Ripon rose on behalf of the King in 1645, under the leadership of the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Derry, and the Earl of Derby. See *Calendar of Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding* 33 (Mar. 2, 1645-6).

him already [1]), to accompany him to Ireland, whither he was going as Lord Deputy, and assist in the restoration of its down-trodden Church. This he definitely chose as his work, and in the same year he crossed with Wentworth to Ireland.

II

The state of the Irish Church at this time was a very deplorable one, as indeed it had been ever since the beginning of the Reformation period, if not before [2]. It is true that "the Church of Ireland, called *Ecclesia Hibernica*," as it is described in many statutes, had preserved its continuity as an organized society through the Reformation. Its orders were unimpaired and its fundamental principles remained; but that is about all that can be said. The movement had taken a particularly disorderly course, as was but natural in view of the fact that it was imposed from without, not developed from within. "It was the creature of the State," it has been truly said, "as no other Church in the world was" [3]. And the English governors who endeavoured to impose the Act of Supremacy upon Romanists and Churchmen alike cared little for the internal administration of the Church. Ecclesiastical property was shamelessly alienated on all sides, and what was left was used by the holders as though it were their own private possession [4]. The bishops were mostly English or Scotch; and although the former were more popular than the latter [5], they were not less out of touch

[1] *Strafford Letters* i. 57 f., 124 (London, 1739). Sir George Radcliffe and Sir Christopher Wandesford were other Yorkshire friends of his.

[2] For a very graphic account of the state of the Irish Church at this time see a letter of Strafford to Laud, dated Jan. 31, 163$\frac{3}{4}$, in the *Strafford Letters* (i. 187 f.).

[3] S. R. Gardiner, *History of England* viii. 53.

[4] A list of Irish bishops of this period who endowed their families out of the spoils of their bishoprics is given by J. A. Carr, *Life and Times of Archbishop Ussher* 216, note.

[5] So Bramhall says in a letter to Laud, dated Aug. 7, 1639 (*State Papers, Ireland*, vol. 256). He adds that it is rumoured that, if episcopacy be overthrown in Scotland, the Scottish bishops will be sent to Ireland, and hopes that it may not be the case.

with their people. Moreover, it was the usual policy of those in power, inherited from earlier days, to compel the Irish to adopt the English language and English customs; and very little effort had been made to provide services and religious instruction in Irish for those who knew no other tongue [1].

A Church so situated had naturally gone from bad to worse. On the other hand, the bulk of the Irish people had gradually become organized into a Roman Catholic separation, partly led by former clergy of the Irish Church who had not accepted the Reformation changes, but mainly by fresh emissaries from abroad [2]. On the other hand, Ulster was gradually being colonized by settlers or "planters" from Scotland, the great majority of whom were staunchly presbyterian. As for the Irish Church itself, its prevailing tendencies were strongly in the direction of Calvinism [3]. A collection of Articles compiled in 1566 had been exchanged in 1615 for a new collection, made under Usher's guidance, in which the predestinarian element was predominant, and the most widely different subjects of doctrine, discipline and practice were dogmatically determined [4].

Such were the conditions with which Strafford had to deal; for ecclesiastical and civil affairs alike had their place in the great system of "Thorough," the moving spirits of which were Archbishop Laud and he [5]. Laud pressed for instant uniformity, since the king desired to see "the jurisdiction

[1] The Irish New Testament was published in 1603, and the Book of Common Prayer in 1608; but it does not appear that they were even intended for general use.

[2] Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland* i. 464-6.

[3] The reason doubtless was that many of the English Puritans had been preferred to benefices or dignities in Ireland. Travers, for example, had been made Provost of Trinity College Dublin (*Works* i. cxii note).

[4] Both sets of Articles are printed in Usher, *Works*, ed. Elrington, vol. i. app. iii. The latter may not inaccurately be regarded as one of the sources of the Westminster Confession (A. F. Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly* 373 f., and especially 381 note).

[5] The letters which passed between the two friends are the best account that we possess of Irish affairs during this period. (See the *Strafford Letters*: Laud's letters are reprinted in his *Works* in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, vols. vi and vii.)

of the Church . . . to be maintained against both recusants and other factionists whatsoever"[1]. But Strafford, who was on the spot and therefore saw better than he what was required, realized that a reformation must precede all else: it would be "a goodly reformation surely, to force a conformity to a religion, whereas yet there is hardly to be found a church to receive, or an able minister to teach the people. No, no, let us fit ourselves in these two . . . and then have with them and spare not: I believe the hottest will not set his foot faster or further on than I shall do"[2]. But, great as was Strafford's respect for Usher's learning and integrity, he naturally found him but a lukewarm helper in a plan which involved a doctrinal as well as a disciplinary reformation[3]. On the other hand, Bramhall[4] was exactly suited to his purpose. He at once became Strafford's right-hand man; and subsequently he became familiarly known amongst puritans as the "Irish Canterbury"[5].

In a letter written to Laud shortly after he crossed to Ireland, Bramhall describes things as he found them in Dublin and elsewhere: "First, for the fabricks, it is hard to say whether the Churches be more ruinous and sordid, or the people irreverent; Even in Dublin, the metropolis of the kingdom, and seat of justice (to begin the inquisition where the reformation will begin), we find our parochial

[1] *Strafford Letters* i. 82 (Laud to Strafford, Ap. 30, 1633).

[2] Ibid. i. 172 (Strafford to Laud, Dec. 1633). Cf. i. 186–7, where he says that to enforce uniformity without a previous reformation would be "as a man going to warfare without munition or arms."

[3] "The truth is, my Lord Primate of Armagh gave himself over so much to the search of the Fathers, and all antiquity, and to that apostolic work of praying and preaching the Word, that he had no time scarce once to think of the discipline of the Church or to regulate what was amiss." So writes a younger contemporary, Clogy, in his *Life of Bedell* (London, 1862) p. 74.

[4] "And for Dr Bramhall," wrote Laud, Oct. 14, 1633, "I think, with your lordship's direction and countenance, he will be able to do any service that can be put upon him" (*Works* i. 124).

[5] The same name was given to William Chappell, Dean of Cashel and afterwards Bishop of Cork, for his conduct as Provost of Trinity College Dublin (J. S. Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, ed. Killen, Belfast, 1867, i. 170 note).

church converted to the Lord Deputy's stable, a second to a nobleman's dwelling house, the quire of a third to a tennis court, and the Vicar acts the keeper. In Christ's Church, the principal church in Ireland, whither the Lord Deputy and Council repair every Sunday, the Vaults, from one end of the Minster to another, are made into tippling rooms, for beer, wine, and tobacco, demised all to Popish recusants, and by them and others so much frequented in time of Divine Service, that though there be no danger of blowing up the assembly above their heads, yet there is of poisoning them with the fumes. The table used for the administration of the blessed Sacrament in the midst of the quire, made an ordinary seat for maidens and apprentices. . . . This being the case in Dublin, your Lordship will judge what we may expect in the country"[1].

He goes on to speak of other evils. The clergy as a whole suffer, in that so many of the benefices are in the hands of their superiors by means of commendams or dispensations: it is said that "one bishop in the remoter parts of the kingdom doth hold three and twenty benefices with cure." And even this is not altogether to be wondered at, because alienations of property have made the bishops themselves so poor. For example, "the Earl of Cork holds the whole Bishopric of Lismore at the rent of 40s., or five marks by the year"[2], and there are many others not much better, or even worse.

Here then Bramhall had his work. A royal visitation was held almost immediately, he being one of the commissioners; in the same year he became Archdeacon of Meath; and on May 26 of the following year he was consecrated by Usher as Bishop of Londonderry, one of the richest sees in the

[1] *State Papers, Ireland*, vol. 254 (Bramhall to Laud, Aug. 10, 1633). The letter has been printed by Collier, not very correctly, and reproduced by Mant and Haddan. In particular, the last paragraph but one is omitted altogether.

[2] Vesey gives several other instances. "Cloyne was reduced to five marks per annum, hence the Bishop was called *Episcopus quinque marcarum*; Aghadoe to 01.01.08," &c. (Vesey, *Life*). See also Bramhall to Usher, Ap. 26, 1641 (Bramhall, *Works* I. lxxxix).

kingdom[1]. On Feb. 28, 1635, he was put into the commission "for the examination and establishment of fees in Ireland"; and from this time his name occurs in connexion with almost every Irish business of importance till 1640. In the winter of 1637–8 he paid a visit to England on the business of the Irish Church[2], and gained the warm appreciation of the English Primate[3]; so that after this date he was the trusted representative of both Strafford and Laud. Our best plan will be to consider his action under three heads.

1. First, as to Church property. Like other great bishops of the time, Bramhall was an excellent man of business, and during the whole of his episcopate in Ireland he was engaged in settling the affairs of the Church on good business principles. He took steps to recover for the Church such of its possessions as were wrongly held, bringing actions at law and resorting to the Lord Deputy for support where necessary[4]. He bought back impropriate tithes, using for the

[1] Edmund Lacy, writing to Secretary Nicholas, calls it a "dainty bishopric" (*State Papers, Ireland*, Ap. 29, 1634); and Usher says it is "absolutely the best in this whole kingdom" (Usher to Ward, April 30, 1634: *Works*, ed. Elrington, xv. 578).

[2] For Bramhall's visit to England see Laud, *Works* vi. 511; *Rawdon Papers* 41 f. It was on this visit, whilst he was in Yorkshire, that there took place between him and Dr Cosin, afterwards Bishop of Durham, "a long argument about Conformity to the orders of the Church, the measure of exacting it, and the most probable way of obtaining it, and making the King, the Church, and the people happy by it. The Doctor was for a stiff rein and a severe discipline, to hold them in with *Bit* and *Bridle*, lest they fall upon us. But his Lordship was for some allay and a more gentle moderamen. . . . The Constitution of the Church of *England* is eminently sweet and merciful . . . having neither the fiercenesse of the Roman Tyranny, nor the licentiousnes of some *democraticall* and popular Reformations; the Bishop of *Derry's* Judgement and practice were of the same complexion with the Church, he had a great deale of fire in his body, but it was not in the power of his passion to debauch his reason, which remained still clear notwithstanding any smoak that might arise from his temper" (Vesey, *Life*).

[3] Laud's letters are full of references to Bramhall after this date: see especially Laud, *Works* vi. 498, vii. 379, 387, 445.

[4] Usually however this was not necessary: for, as Laud wrote to Bramhall, the sun was shining on the Irish Church. The king had resolved to restore to it all the impropriations in his hands, a plan which could only be carried out after the Restoration. Naturally others were not backward in following this example. Bramhall gives a conspicuous instance in the case

purpose moneys borrowed on the security of the issues, or his own property, or moneys given or lent him by Laud[1] and other English friends. He was instrumental in obtaining several acts of parliament which operated in the same direction, preventing encroachments and enabling leases to be granted on advantageous terms[2]. And so, as Bishop Vesey writes: "By these and other ways (not come to my knowledge) he regain'd to the Church in the space of four years time, Thirty, some say, Fourty Thousand pounds *per annum*, whereof he gave account at his going into *England* to the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, so that many a poor vicar now eats of the trees, the Bishop of *Derry*[3] planted"[4].

2. Next, as to Church order. There was then nothing like a canonical system in the Irish Church, and he set to work to provide one. Here it is easy to see that Bramhall's plan was open to criticism; in fact, few or none in our day would accept it. And yet it is simply that which has commended itself to most English statesmen down to the nineteenth century. It was, in a word, to break down every mark of singularity, and to bring Ireland into line with England. Here was a Church which was disorderly and backward in the extreme: surely the best way to reform it would be to let it share one common life with the English Church, so that there might be, in fact if not in words[5], not the united Churches but the United Church of England and Ireland. Such was the policy

of Lord Ranelagh: "yet," he adds, "we thanke not his devotion so much as the Sun shininge" (*State Papers, Ireland*, Bramhall to Laud, Febr. 23, 1637–8).

[1] "The Archbishop of Canterbury countenanced the work and lent him his hand and his head, and his purse too, having design'd fourty thousand pounds for it" (Vesey, *Life*).

[2] Bramhall, *Works* I. xix (Note H).

[3] There is a play upon words here: *Derry* (Doire) means an oak grove or wood (P. W. Joyce, *Irish Local Names Explained*, Dublin, new edition, p. 38).

[4] Cf. Loftus, *Oratio funebris* 17, and Jeremy Taylor's *Funeral Sermon* (Bramhall, *Works* I. lxi). See Lambeth MSS., No. dccccxliii. p. 535.

[5] Of course, it was only by the Irish Act of Union (art. 5) that "the Churches of England and Ireland" were (in law) "united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called the United Church of England and Ireland."

of Laud[1], of Strafford[2], and of Bramhall himself. At the time, its partial success produced a marvellous cleansing and invigorating of the Irish Church[3]; afterwards, in days of degeneracy and decay, its effects were disastrous; had it succeeded entirely, it must have grievously imperilled the very existence of that Church. But fortunately there were others, like Usher and Bedell, who saw farther, and thus were instrumental in preserving a measure of individuality to the Irish Church.

In the letter to Laud from which we have already quoted[4], Bramhall wrote: "Next, for the clergy; I find few footsteps yet of foreign differences. . . . But I doubt much whether the clergy be very orthodox, and could wish both the Articles and Canons of the Church of England were established here by Act of Parliament or State; that as we live all under one king, so we might both in doctrine and discipline observe an uniformity."

Accordingly, in the Convocation of 1634 proposals were brought forward, with the reluctant acquiescence of the Primate[5], for the adoption by the Irish Church of the English Articles of Religion and the Canons of 1604. Neither project passed without difficulty. With regard to the Canons, Bramhall, who took the lead in the Upper House, urged their acceptance on the twofold ground of their greater latitude in non-essentials and of the practical convenience of such an agreement with the English Church[6]. His view being at

[1] See his letters to Strafford, *passim.*

[2] "Undoubtedly, till we be brought all under one form of divine service, the crown is never safe on this side" (*Strafford Letters* ii. 30). See also *ante*, p. 87, note 2.

[3] The preamble of the Irish Statute, 10 Car. I. c. xxiii, declares, not untruly, "That as no Church under heaven did ever stand more in need, so none did ever finde more Royale and munificent Patrons and Protectors, than the poore Church of Ireland."

[4] *Ante*, p. 87 f.

[5] Usher proposed a plan for the adoption of the English Articles without the rejection of the Irish Articles of 1615 (Strafford to Laud, Dec. 16, 1634; *Strafford Letters* i. 342, cp. 298).

[6] He "discoursed, with great moderation and sobriety, of the convenience of having the Articles of peace and Communion in every National Church, worded in that latitude, that dissenting persons in those things that

length agreed to, he proposed a canon for acceptance, based, as he says, on "a Synode held at Cashell soon after the first conquest of this nation by the English"[1]. Meanwhile however difficulties had arisen in the Lower House, where the puritan majority, without any communication with the bishops, had ordered the Canons of 1604 to be examined by a committee, and inserted in one of them, which they were prepared to accept, the Irish Articles, "to be allowed and received under the Pain of Excommunication"[2]. Thereupon Strafford took matters into his own hands. He sent for the Prolocutor and committee, and roundly rebuked them in the presence of the Primate and four Bishops, telling them "how unlike Clergymen, that ought Canonical Obedience to their Superiors, they had proceeded in their Committee: how unheard of a Part it was for a few petty Clerks to presume to make Articles of Faith, without the Privity or Consent of State or Bishop"[3], and so forth. He directed that the English Articles should be voted upon, for or against, "without admitting any other discourse at all," and desired Usher to draft a canon embodying them. Not being satisfied with this draft, Strafford proceeded to draw up one himself, "more after the Words of

concern'd not the Christian faith, might subscribe, and the Church not loose the benefitt of their labours, for an opinion, which it may be they could not help; that it were to be wish'd that such Articles might be contrived for the whole Christian world, but especially that the Protestant Churches under his Majestie's dominion might *all speake the same language*, and Particularly that those of *England* and *Ireland* being Reformed by the same principle and Rule of Scripture expounded by universal tradition, councils, Fathers, and other wayes of conveyance, might confess their faith in the same forme; for if they were of the same opinion, why did they not express themselves in the same words?" (Vesey, *Life*).

[1] *State Papers, Ireland*, Bramhall to Laud, Dec. 20, 1634. The Synod of Cashel to which he refers is that of A. D. 1172, which, in the words of Giraldus (*in Hib. Expugn.* i. 33, 34), "constitutiones sacras . . . emisit, ecclesiae illius statum ad Anglicanae ecclesiae formam redigere modis omnibus elaborando" (Girald. Cambr., *Opp.* v. 280, Rolls Series). He gives the canon itself as follows: "Itaque omnia divina, ad instar sacrosanctae ecclesiae, juxta quod Anglicana observat ecclesia, in omnibus partibus ecclesiae amodo tractentur." See also Wilkins, *Concilia* i. 471–3, and Bramhall, *Works* v. 82.

[2] Strafford to Laud, Dec. 16, 1634 (*Strafford Letters* i. 343).

[3] Ibid.

the Canon in England," which "was unanimously voted, first with the Bishops and then by the rest of the Clergy, excepting one Man"[1]. So the matter was settled[2], at least ostensibly[3]. The question of the Canons, which were also brought forward by Bramhall, was less difficult. Beyond one or two particular points[4], Usher had no objection to them in substance, but was "hugely against" the acceptance of them as they stood, "lest *Ireland* might become subject to the Church of *England*, as the Province of *York* is to that of *Canterbury*"[5]. Accordingly, it was agreed that such of them as were suitable should be adopted, and others added to fit the circumstances of the Irish Church. This was done, mainly by Bramhall; and the resulting body of one hundred Canons was accepted by the Convocation[6], and published with the Articles in Sept. 1635[7].

[1] Reid, *op. cit.* i. 174 note, suggests that this was probably Hamilton, the minister of Ballywalter. But according to Bramhall, in his letter of Dec. 20, 1634, it passed "not a man dissentinge, nor any demurringe except two, Doctor Hoyle and one Mr FitzGerald."

[2] The three chief extant authorities, Strafford's letter, Bramhall's letter, and Vesey's account in the *Life* (based on the report of Thomas Price, then Archdeacon of Kilmore and subsequently Archbishop of Cashel), are really in no way discordant; but the story of the Convocation has been very variously told by Mant and other writers who had not access to Bramhall's letter.

[3] As is well known, the precise effect of the settlement remained for a time in dispute, Usher and some other bishops requiring subscription to the Irish Articles too, whereas Bramhall, writing in 1658-9, says that "if any Bishop had been known to have required any man to subscribe to the Irish Articles, after the English were received and authorized under the Great Seal of Ireland, he would have been called to account for it" (*Works* v. 81). On the whole question see Mant, *op. cit.* i. 491-5; to the authorities there given may be added Carte, *Life of Ormonde* i. 149, Bramhall as quoted above, and Vesey's account in the *Life*. See also Elrington's *Life of Usher* (Usher, *Works* i. 176 f.).

[4] e.g. bowing at the name of Jesus. See Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus* 256, and Bramhall, *Works* v. 76 f.

[5] Strafford to Laud, Mar. 10, 1634. Strafford thinks this ridiculous: "this Crotchet put the good Man into such an Agony, as you cannot believe so learned a Man should be so troubled withal."

[6] The Irish Canons are given by Wilkins, *Concilia* iv. 498 f. They are carefully and minutely compared with the English Canons by Mant, *op. cit.* i. 497-504; Elrington, *Life of Usher* (Usher, *Works* i. 180-6).

[7] Radcliffe to Bramhall, Sept. 22, 1635 (*Rawdon Papers*, ed. Berwick, p. 22). Laud thought that "the English Canons entire (especially with some few amendments) would have been better," but readily acquiesces (Laud to

3. So much for his action in matters of order[1]. We now turn to his general administration, to see how he carried out that which had been enacted. Here again the need was great, for the services of the Church were in no less disorder than the fabrics. In his own diocese, he says, "I found all most the whole resident Clergy absolute irregulars, the very ebullition of Scotland, but conformists very rare, and those rather in judgment than practise. They are ordinarily licensed preachers and beneficers long before they enter into holy orders. It would trouble a man to finde twelve comon praier bookes in all their churches, And those onely not cast behinde the Altar, because they have none, but in place of it a table ten yeards longe, where they sitte and receive ye Sacrament together like good fellowes"[2].

"In mine owne diocess," he writes again three years after-

Usher, May 10, 1635, *Works* vi. 418). "The name of Jesus is little beholden to their stiffness" (To Wentworth, July 31, 1635, ibid. vii. 156); but there are some things which he rejoices at, including "a passing good canon about confession" (To the same, May 12, 1635; ibid. vii. 132).

[1] The statement has frequently been made (e.g. by Reid, *op. cit.* i. 176) that Bramhall opposed Bedell and Usher when they brought forward the 8th, 86th, and 94th Canons, which permitted the use of the Irish language. It is based upon a letter of Bishop Anthony Dopping of Meath to a clergyman, dated Dec. 14, 1685: "In the convocation held at Dublin 1634, there were no small debates about the version of the Bible and the liturgy of the Church into the Irish tongue, for the benefit and instruction of the natives; Dr Bedell Bishop of Kilmore being for the affirmative, and Dr Bramhall Bishop of Derry opposing it. The reasons of the former were drawn from the principles of theology, and the good of souls; of the latter, from politics and maxims of state, and especially from an act of Parliament passed in this kingdom in the reign of Henry VIII for obliging the natives to learn the English tongue. However, the reasons of Bishop Bedell were thought so satisfactory (especially being countenanced by the authority of primate Usher) that the convocation thought fit to pass two canons concerning it," &c. (In the appendix to Birch's *Life of Robert Boyle*: Boyle, *Works* I. clxxxii, London, 1772.) Bishop Dopping says that he derived part of his information from the life of Bedell by his son-in-law Mr Clogy. The Life as published, however (*Speculum Episcoporum, or The Apostolique Bishop*, &c., by Alexander Clogy, London, 1862) contains no such passage; and Bishop Dopping (born Mar. 28, 1643: Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae* v. 143) cannot be considered a contemporary writer. It is quite probable, however, that Bramhall, like Usher himself (*Works* vi. 118) and Laud (*Works* vi. 374) and many more, may have taken up this position.

[2] Bramhall to Laud, Dec. 20, 1634 (*State Papers, Ireland*, vol. 254).

wards, "I have had Anababtisticall prophetesses runne gaddinge upp and downe, and the dores of churches Barrecadoed upp for a quarter of a yeare together"[1]; and what he found in his own diocese was to be found elsewhere too. To a strong man like Bramhall it was fairly easy to set things in order, so long as he had only to do with sloth and neglect; and the effect of his action was soon felt far and wide. He rebuilt churches and parsonage houses, he proved himself, as Jeremy Taylor says, "a public enemy to non-residence"[2]; he did all that he could to secure a more learned clergy; he showed a conspicuous example of hospitality[3]. But Ulster was full of puritans who were neither slothful nor neglectful, but were as keenly in earnest as Bramhall himself; and with these he could do little or nothing. Moreover, their number was continually being augmented by fresh arrivals who had taken the Covenant in Scotland[4], and who formed a nucleus for the opposition[5].

We have only a few instances of Bramhall's dealings with puritans, and they show us that he, like other bishops of his day, was engaged alternately in arguing with ministers and then bringing compulsion to bear upon them, in the way which is so repulsive to our ideas. But although he was hasty and impatient in manner, he does not seem to have shown exceptional severity towards them.

[1] Bramhall to Laud, Feb. 23, 163$\frac{7}{8}$ (*State Papers, Ireland*, vol. 254).

[2] *Funeral Sermon* (Bramhall, *Works* I. lxxi).

[3] Many of the expelled Scottish bishops, including the Archbishops of Glasgow and St Andrews and the Bishop of Ross, found a refuge with him (Vesey, *Life*); a fact which probably had something to do with his unpopularity with the Presbyterians.

[4] Not all who came from Scotland, however, were Covenanters. Many of the Scottish clergy who had been expelled by the Assembly for refusing the Covenant came to Ireland, and were befriended by Bramhall (G. Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland* iii. 57).

[5] In a letter to Laud, Feb. 23, 163$\frac{7}{8}$, Bramhall speaks of the "desperate example the contumacious non conformists in Scotland have given both to England and Ireland," and says that this contagion has "lately spread itself over the face of the whole counties of Downe and Conner, and some adiacent places." His own diocese was one of the worst; it is "placed in the middest of the Sotch [*sic*] plantations, and itself two third parts planted wth them" (To the same, Nov. 2, 1638: *State Papers, Ireland*).

In August 1636 he happened to be present at a public conference held at Belfast by Henry Leslie, Bishop of Down and Connor, with five of his clergy who had refused to subscribe the new Canons, and whom he was ultimately compelled to depose. A report of the Conference, written and circulated on behalf of the ministers [1], shows that Leslie behaved with conspicuous moderation and loving wisdom; but it hardly shows Bramhall in so favourable a light. According to the ministers, at times his words "were rather bitter than to the purpose" [2]. Bitter they certainly were, if correctly reported, though undoubtedly they were all very much to the point [3]; but the report was impugned by Leslie [4], and cannot be said to prove more than what is indicated elsewhere, viz. that Bramhall was both skilled in controversy and hasty in speech [5].

[1] It is printed in Killen's edition of Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* vol. i, at pp. 523–542 and 196–202.

[2] "In all the words which were spoken by the Bishop of Derry, the opponent, to wit, Mr Hamilton, either answered not at all, as when the words were rather bitter than to the purpose; or if the Bishop of Derry's words seemed to be to the purpose, and required an answer, then the opponent still directed his speech to the bishop of Down, who was before him, and not to the bishop of Derry, who was behind his back" (*op. cit.* p. 532).

[3] To give one instance; on Hamilton saying "I desire to know by what Scripture is such kneeling [i.e. at the Communion] ordained," Bramhall exclaimed, "Give him Scripture for a peck of oats to his horse!" (*op. cit.* p. 539).

[4] Leslie published his sermon, an admirable one, with which the Conference opened, under the title *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church* . . . (Dublin, 1637), and added to it his repudiation of "a late Libell, the foolishest that ever was spread abroad, in writing, praetending to set downe a relation of a certaine Conference betweene myselfe, & some unconforme Ministers of my Diocese" (p. 109). He goes on to say that "they have shamefully traduced a Reverend and Worthy Praelate of our *Church*, who came in but by accident; making him to rave throughout their whole Libell; whereas it is well knowne, if he had entered the lists of disputation with them (which he did not, speaking but very little, and that not unto them, but unto my selfe) an armie of such Pigmeyes could not have stood before him . . . All who were present, testifie they never heard him speake any such words." If any will examine them, "they shall finde such unworthy and sordid trash to bee farre from both the candor of his stile, and gravity of his Iudgement" (ibid. p. 111 f.).

[5] He said on one occasion "that if all the Jesuits of the Church of Rome had conspired together to hinder the propagation of the Gospel in Ulster,

At another time we find him committing a clergyman of his diocese "for his lewd praying for the prosperous success of Scotland in the maintenance of Religion"[1]. And at a later date still he took a prominent part in the proceedings against Bishop Adair of Killala, who had got into trouble for his presbyterian sympathies. A certain John Corbet, minister of Bonhill near Dumbarton, had been expelled from his charge for refusing to subscribe the declaration of the Assembly against episcopacy. He came to Ireland, where he was befriended by Bramhall, and began writing against presbyterianism[2]. Soon he was presented to the vicarage of Templemore in the diocese of Killala. Bishop Adair however received him very coldly, and told him, "after the Scottish manner of jesting"[3], that "it was an ill bird that defiled its

they could not have contrived it more effectually than had been done" by certain unwise arrangements of the glebe which prevented the clergy living near their churches (Clogy, *Life of Bedell* 53). In the course of a hearing before the High Commission, he called one Mr Bayly a despoiler (ib. 122); at Strabane, according to a hostile writer, he called a puritan who was before him "a young devil" (Read, *op. cit.* i. 259, from Adair's MS.). In 1652 he fell out with Hyde, and "read me such a lecture as I never heard" (Hyde to Taylor, Nov. 2, 1652: *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers* ii. 153); a week later Hyde writes that Bramhall "hath lately had as rough an encounter with me as ever I met with in my life, and tho' he complains of me for using some sharp expressions to him, trust me he gave me greater provocations than can be imagined" (Hyde to Nicholas, Nov. 9: *Clarendon State Papers*, folio, iii. 111 f.). It may be mentioned that Bramhall was twice accused in the Star Chamber in 1637, once of using (Bramhall to Laud, June 7, 1637, *State Papers, Ireland*; Strafford to Coventry, Sept. 11, 1637, *Rawdon Papers* 33), and once of allowing (Vesey, *Life*) unguarded language.

[1] *Rawdon Papers* 43.

[2] Amongst other things he wrote *The Epistle Congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor of the Societie of Jesu to the Covenanters in Scotland* [Dublin], 1640, in which he drew out the parallel between the Covenanters and the Jesuits. Robert Baillie wrote in reply *A Postscript for the personate Jesuit Lysimachus Nicanor*, which was added first to his *Canterburian's Self-conviction* ("Written in *March*, and printed in *April*, 1640"), and then to the *Large Supplement of the Canterburian Self-conviction* ("Imprinted, 1641"). In the former he speculates as to the identity of the author, "*Leslie*, or *Maxwell*, or *Michell*, or who else of the faction" (p. 3). In the latter he says, "For as now the report from *Ireland* goes, the Book hath not any one certaine Authour, but the matter of it collected by sundry, was disposit and put in that shape by *Bramble* of Derry" (pp. 4, 5).

[3] So Clogy, *op. cit.* 130.

own nest," and that "he was a corbey that had fled out of the ark, and that he should not have where to rest his foot in his diocese"[1]. Adair was a *persona ingrata* with the Lord Deputy, who had already resolved on his deposition[2]. He was now brought to trial before the High Commission at Dublin, and Parliament having met whilst the trial was in progress, he was unanimously censured by the Bishops and excluded from the House, Bramhall speaking with excessive severity[3]. When the High Commission met again, Bedell alone spoke in his favour, urging that deprivation would be too severe a punishment for such an offence[4]; but he was condemned, and deprived of his see on May 18, 1640[5].

Things such as these would account for the unpopularity of Bishop Bramble[6], as they called him,—it was a favourite

[1] Vesey, *Life*.

[2] Strafford to Charles, Sept. 2, 1639 (*Strafford Letters* ii. 383); to Sir George Radcliffe, Sept. 23, 1639 (T. D. Whitaker, *Life of Sir George Radcliffe*, London, 1810, p. 182).

[3] It is not quite fair however to say, as is done by Reid, *op. cit.*, that Bramhall declared that he deserved to be thrown into the sea in a sack. The account in the *Lords' Journals* is as usual in a kind of running shorthand. Bramhall's speech is given as follows: "That it was moved by one of the Bishops in the Morning (though after adjournment) that the Lord Bishop of Killala might have his Writ of Summons to this Parliament; 'tis true, that this House hath the proper judgement of it: He repeats his offence, and desires that this House may declare him unfit, being a Favourer of the Covenant of Scotland, and like. ¶ Fit to be thrown into the Sea in a Sack, not to see Sun, nor enjoy the Air. ¶ The King may restore him after Deprivation, nay after Degradation, because of the indelible Character, since his Holy Orders; if His Majesty, upon Mercy, shall be so pleased" (*Lords' Journals*, Ireland, i. 112). It cannot be said to what, or to whom, the second paragraph is applicable.

[4] Clogy, *op. cit.* 131–3. Carte, *Life of Ormonde* i. 194, confounds the proceedings in Parliament with those in the High Commission.

[5] Usher wrote to the Archbishop of Tuam, but in vain, desiring him to suspend the execution of the sentence (Wandesford to Radcliffe, June 21, 1640; Whitaker, *op. cit.* 252). Soon afterwards Adair was appointed by the King to the see of Waterford.

[6] He is constantly so called by Baillie: almost the only variant is in the title of a tract, *A Review of the Seditious Pamphlet lately published in Holland by Dr Bramhell, pretended Bishop of London Derry*, &c., Delph, 1649. This was answered by Richard Watson in his ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΟΣ, *or a Second Faire Warning*, &c., Hagh, 1651. To this is prefixed a letter by Dr Creighton, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, in which he says, "What, hath the Bramble scratcht you by the face, that you so wilfully mistake his name? You impudence!" The

witticism of theirs to call their opponents by nicknames,—with the puritans. But it was intensified by the fact that he was held to be largely responsible for framing the so-called Black Oath: an oath in peculiarly offensive terms[1] which was imposed upon all the Scots in Ulster under severe penalties, to ensure their loyalty and to detach them from the Covenant. As a matter of fact, he probably had nothing to do with it: such evidence as there is points the other way[2]. But Bramhall was known to be in the counsels of the Lord Deputy; his activity in enforcing the oath was great; and his methods were not conciliatory[3]. Nevertheless, a careful examination of the available evidence leaves the impression that Bramhall's ecclesiastical administration was on the whole singularly tolerant and just: and although what he says of Roman Catholics in Ireland would not be true of Separatists, his own words, written subsequently in answer to a Roman Catholic opponent, give no unfair view of its general character:

"The Earl of Strafford, then Lieutenant of Ireland, did commit much to my hands the political regiment of that Church [i.e. of Ireland] for the space of eight years. . . . I remember not one Roman Catholic that suffered in all that time, but only the titular Archbishop of Cashel, who was indeed imprisoned for three or four days, not only upon suspicion, but upon information out of Spain, that he was a pensioner of the Catholic King's, and being found to be no such dangerous person, upon my representation was dismissed. Let no man hence imagine that we neglected our duties. We did our work by more noble and more successful means than penal laws—by building of Churches and mansion-houses for ministers, by introducing a learned clergy, by enjoining them residence, by affording them countenance and protection and means of hospitality, by planting and ordering schools for the

original letter is amongst the Clarendon State Papers (*Calendar* ii. 90). I cannot agree with Mr Haddan (*Works* III. preface, note b; I. xxx. note t) that it is an accidental mistake. Every student of puritan literature from Elizabeth downwards will recognise it as a familiar thing.

[1] It is given in the *Strafford Letters* ii. 345.

[2] See *Strafford Letters* ii. 344–6.

[3] So much, at least, may be gathered from the statement in Adair's MS.; see *ante*, p. 97 note.

education of youth, and by looking carefully to the education and marriages of the king's wards"[1].

III

Naturally, when the troubles began, Bramhall was marked out for attack. A committee of the Irish House of Commons was appointed to draw up the charges on Feb. 27, 1641[2]; and on March 4 he and three others were impeached before the Irish House of Lords[3]. His friends urged him to flee; but instead of doing so[4], he hastened to Dublin and "showed himselfe in the Parliament House"[5], whereupon he was taken into the custody of the Black Rod[6]; so that of the three great friends, Strafford, Laud, and Bramhall, the first and last were being tried at the Bar of the English and Irish Houses of Lords, whilst the second lay a prisoner in the Tower awaiting his trial. The charges were of unconstitutional tyranny in various forms; but in his case they were at first narrowed down to a close scrutiny of his action on behalf of the revenues of the Church. Bramhall defied them to prove that he had taken "so much as a pair of gloves"[7] from any man; and presently, baffled in this[8], they returned to more general charges[9]. From his prison in Dublin Castle he wrote to ask for Usher's help[10]. The Primate replied with great kindness,

[1] *Works* ii. 124 f.

[2] *Journals of the Irish House of Commons* i. 328 f.

[3] *Lords' Journals* (Ireland) i. 165 f. Captain Audley Mervyn's speech, together with the Articles of Impeachment, is given in Rushworth, iv. 214 f. At the Restoration Mervyn was a strong conformist, and was Speaker of the Irish House of Commons when Bramhall held the same office in the Lords.

[4] His worst enemies knew that the Bishop was no coward. "Never fear when the cause is just" was one of his usual sayings (Vesey, *Life*).

[5] Ibid.

[6] He wrote to his wife, March 12, 164$\frac{0}{1}$, "I have been near a fortnight at the black rod, charged with a treason" (*Works* i. lxxxviii).

[7] *Rawdon Papers* 75.

[8] Although "there were above two hundred petitions put in against him, and he himself denied leave to answer by word of mouth": Jeremy Taylor's *Funeral Sermon* (Bramhall, *Works* i. lxiv).

[9] The English House of Commons appointed a committee to draw up charges in support of the impeachments (*Cal. S. P. Dom.*, June 19, 1641).

[10] Bramhall to Usher, April 26, 1641 (*Works* i. lxxxix). Although Usher

saying that he had urged the King on his behalf, and that "My Lord Strafford, the very night before his suffering . . . sent me to the king, giving me in charge, among other particulars, to put him in mind of you and the other two Lords that are under the same pressure, who thereupon declared to me that he had already given orders that the Parliament was not to proceed in their judgment, until they could show some precedent of such legal process, exercised there since Poynings' Act"[1].

At length, early in 1642, he was set at liberty, without however being acquitted of the charges against him[2]; and he retired to his diocese. His release was only a respite from trouble: in the North he was subjected to one petty persecution or act of violence after another[3], and at length, on the urgent advice of his friends, he embarked privately for England, and returned to his native county. There he occupied himself in the King's cause with the Marquess of Newcastle and others[4]. But the disastrous battle of Marston Moor showed that there was no longer any hope in the North; and he, with many more, passed over to Hamburg in July, 1644. He was at once proscribed, and continued to be so till 1660[5].

He crossed again to Ireland in 1648 on the King's business[6],

and Bramhall often differed, they were great friends (ibid. p. xxi, and the passages there referred to). At times they had been united in opposition to both Laud and Strafford, as when they resisted the retention of the Provostship of Trinity College by Bishop Chappell, in defiance of the statutes (*Strafford Letters* ii. 194, 211; and Elrington, *Life of Usher* 191 f.).

[1] *Rawdon Papers* 84 f.

[2] In answer to a question from the Lords, the Commons replied on Aug. 6, 1642, that they still retained their charges against Bramhall and Sir George Radcliffe (*Commons' Journals*, Ireland, i. 181). They were ordered by the Lords to be withdrawn on Jan. 20, 1644 (*ib.* i. 217).

[3] See Vesey, *Life*; quoted in *Works* I. ix.

[4] See *ante*, p. 84, note [2]. A sermon preached in York Minster, Jan. 28, 164$\frac{3}{4}$, is preserved (*Works* v. 87).

[5] The Articles of Peace sent by both Houses to the King July 11, 1646, stipulated that Bramhall should not be pardoned (Thurloe, *State Papers* i. 80). So did the Proposals of Oct. 13, 1648 (*State Papers, Dom.*). He was also excluded from the Act of Indemnity of 1652.

[6] "At *Lymerick* the Earl of *Roscomon* got such a fall coming downe a paire of stairs that he lived onely so long to declare his faith (at the Bishop of *Derry's* instance) as it is professed in the Church of *England*: which gave

but soon returned to the continent[1], where he spent the years till the Restoration. At first he lived at Brussels[2], "preaching constantly every Lord's Day, frequently administring the Sacrament and confirming such as desired it, amongst others the Gentleman of whom I had this account, Walter Cooper, Esq."[3] After his return from Ireland he wandered about from place to place, generally in France or the Low Countries[4]. it appears that he even made a journey into Spain; but becoming aware, through the kindness of a woman in whose house he lodged, that he was known to the Inquisition, and would probably be seized, he presently turned back[5]. During the whole time he was engaged, now in ministering to the English refugees, now in helping forward the cause of Prince Charles. Indeed, in 1652, not being satisfied with Hyde's activity in the matter[6], Bramhall became responsible for the fitting out of privateers on his behalf, being at the same time appointed receiver of prizes at Flushing[7]. The office was no lucrative one; the few prizes that were taken he was compelled

such offence to the Romanists there, who would have reported he dyed a Papist if he had not spoke at all, that they threatned the Bishop's death, if he had not suddenly depart the town" (Vesey, *Life*).

[1] The little bark in which he was returning narrowly escaped capture by two frigates of the Parliament (ibid.).

[2] He was at Paris for a time, however, in 1645: *Works* I. xxxi.

[3] Vesey, *Life*.

[4] He was at Rotterdam Oct. 1, 1648 (*Rawdon Papers* 93 note ‡); at Breda May 26, 1650 (Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate* i. 262; the authority there cited however does not mention him); at the Hague Jan. $\frac{16}{26}$, $165\frac{0}{1}$ (*Rawdon Papers* 105); at Paris Dec. 30, 1651 (Bray's *Evelyn* iv. 263 n.) and Nov. 1652 (*Cal. S. P. Clar.* ii. 152); in Zealand (Flushing) from Aug. 1653 to Jan 15, $165\frac{3}{4}$ or later (*Cal. S. P. Clar.* ii. 270, 300; Thurloe, i. 514, &c.); at Antwerp May $\frac{9}{19}$, 1654 (*Rawdon Papers* 139); at Brussels Sept. 1654 (Thurloe, ii. 601); at Flushing again March 1655 (*Cal. S. P. Clar.* iii. 22); at Utrecht July 1656 (*Rawdon Papers* 103); at Brussels July 8, 1659 (Barwick, *Life of John Barwick* 424).

[5] So Vesey: his uncle Dr Walker had heard the story from Bramhall himself, who also mentions the journey to Spain in a letter dated Feb. $165\frac{2}{3}$ (*Works* I. xciii).

[6] See *ante*, p. 97 n. There was for a time an impression amongst the Royalists that Hyde was in receipt of a pension from England (*Cal. S. P. Clar.* ii. 259, 263, 270, 279).

[7] *Cal. S. P. Clar.* ii. 153, 154, 237; and Thurloe, *State Papers* i. 464, 514, 585.

to sell in person[1]. Meanwhile, this excellent man of business[2] lived in poverty and continual jeopardy[3]. He was never tired of helping others, and shared liberally such sums of money as came into his hands; but they were few and far between. The period was one of constant hardship; and it was this period of hardship, when Church and State were alike in hopeless confusion, which helped to make Bramhall the really great man that he was[4].

IV

Let us then ask ourselves, What had become of the Church of England during this period?

As far as the Parliament was able to do so, it had reduced the Church to a mere sect, cutting off everything that witnessed most clearly to her fellowship with Christian

[1] A *Letter of Intelligence out of Holland*, Sept. $\frac{9}{19}$, 1653, says that the prizes taken down to that date were "but two, and those ridiculous, the one being laden with about 10 l. of poor John, the other with tobacco-pype claye, which to make it more base, his lordship went himself to sell at Tergowe" (Thurloe, i. 564, and see the other passages above referred to).

[2] On Jan 15, 1654, Bramhall writes to say that he hopes to negotiate a loan for Charles, though the Dutch part more easily with words than money (*Cal. S. P. Clar.* ii. 300).

[3] During the years 1653–4 he and others were compelled to go under feigned names. He called himself John Pierson, and letters of his are extant with this signature (*Works* I. xcii f.).

[4] The most famous of Bramhall's letters was written during this period: that to Usher, July 20, 1654, in which he says that "in the year 1646, by order from Rome, above 100 of the Romish Clergy were sent into England, consisting of English, Irish, and Scotch, who . . . were most of them soldiers in the Parliament's army, and were daily to correspond with those Romanists in our late king's army that were lately at Oxford, and pretended to fight for His Majesty" (*Works* I. xcv f.). It was first published in Dr Parr's *Life of Usher*, and "was the cause of the whole [first] impression being seized, upon pretence that it was a political or historical account of things not relating to theology, tho' it had been licensed by the Bishop" (so Evelyn, who had heard it from Parr himself: *Diary*, ed. Bray, 1852, ii. 252). The facts stated in the letter have frequently been disputed; but the substance of them appears in the first edition of the *Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the point of obedience to Sovereigns*, by Peter du Moulin [the younger], London, 1664, pp. 58, 60. See also a long note in Elrington, *Life of Usher* 263 ff. On the whole it appears clear that the statements of the letter have at least a basis of fact.

antiquity. But it had made no attempt, from its own point of view, to abolish or to destroy the Church. All that it intended to do, and all that the Westminster Assembly professed to be doing, was to reform the English Church after the model of the best reformed churches of the continent. We may hold, no doubt, that the effect of their action, had it succeeded, would have been the abolition of the historic Church of England; but certainly that was not their object. From their own point of view they were simply carrying the reformation a stage further; and although they abolished episcopacy, proscribed the Prayer Book, and introduced a new Confession of Faith, they never set to work to create a new body, and held that they themselves were none other than the English Church.

It need hardly be said that this was not the view of Bramhall and those who were with him on the continent. They affirmed that the English Church existed still. It was scattered far and wide, but the "sometime flourishing, now poor persecuted, Church of England"[1] had not ceased to be. It was persecuted; some of its members were hiding in England, some were exiles on the continent, some had even conformed with the Presbyterians, or the Independents, or the Baptists; but the English Church was there still. Bramhall and those who were with him went on persistently, working for it, writing on behalf of it, waiting, planning, scheming, doing anything rather than be unfaithful to their holy mother the Church of England. Truly, whereas the exile under Queen Mary was one of the greatest evils that ever befell the English Church, the exile under the Commonwealth and Protectorate was one of the greatest blessings; for it purified and spiritualized men's conceptions of the Church, and made them realize their Churchmanship as they had never done before.

Under such circumstances however, as was only to be expected, the Church had become the butt of her adversaries. The Roman Catholics were doing their utmost to get hold of Charles, and with every hope of success; and they

[1] *Works* i. 266.

tried to persuade English Churchmen at large that there were but two alternatives, Roman Catholicism or Sectarianism. The puritans and sectaries were no less urgent; the overthrow of the old order was, they said, the result of trifling with popery; and now that the cause of the old Church, as people called it, was at an end, the only thing for its members to do was to throw in their lot with one or other of them. Once more, scepticism was very prevalent, as it always must be in an era of revolution; and Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury was just putting forth his great system, which is such a triumph of logical completeness and literary excellence, and yet which, if it were a true theory of the universe, and if all of his *dicta* were to be interpreted strictly, would cut away at the roots everything that a Christian holds most dear.

English Churchmen however were not wanting to face each and all of these, and the foremost amongst them was the Bishop of Derry. In fact, he was constantly occupied in defending the position of the English Church: now in writing professed treatises, now in answering the attacks of others, now in holding disputations with them. His difficulties were great: it was hard to procure books, and often, as at Antwerp, he was indebted to his opponents for the weapons with which he confuted them[1]. It was hard to get his books printed when he had written them; and, as he himself tells us, it was none too easy to write: "They who have composed minds free from distracting cares, and means to maintain them, and friends to assist them, and their books and notes by them, do little imagine with what difficulties poor exiles struggle, whose minds are more intent on what they should eat than what they should write, being chased as vagabonds into the merciless world to beg relief of strangers"[2]. But

[1] "At first he had the allowance of the Jesuits' Library, for having none of his own he was forced to *whet* his *Sword* among the *Philistines* with whom he was to fight. . . . [On their failing him] he applyed himselfe to that of the *Dominicans*, where he had admission, till he finished what he intended" (Vesey, *Life*). The same image is used by Jeremy Taylor in the Preface to his *Ductor Dubitantium*; *Works*, ed. Heber, xi. 346; see *post* p. 131.

[2] *Works* i. 276. Lord Scudamore, afterwards Viscount Sligo, was one who

his work did not suffer: difficulties seemed to call forth all that was best in him; and the English Church found her wisest champion in the hour of her greatest need. There is no divine whose "occasional writings" are of more permanent value. In learning he more than equals the most learned of his adversaries, though his knowledge is wide, extraordinarily wide, rather than profound[1]: in acuteness, in power of debate and in humour, he far surpasses them all. Bramhall is an admirable reasoner, and few writers can put their case so simply, plainly, and convincingly as he. Moreover, he develops as he goes on: he grows constantly in breadth, without losing in definiteness. He admirably exemplifies that tolerant largeness of the Church of England which had been so conspicuous in Andrewes, and in many ways in Laud, and which surely ought always to be one of her greatest glories.

Sooner or later Bramhall had to deal with each of the three classes of assailants above mentioned[2]. Upon him fell the brunt of the Roman Catholic attack: "at home," writes Bishop Vesey, "he had been maligned as a Papist, abroad he is persecuted because he is a Protestant"; it went on continually; "he scarce came into any place but he was assaulted, and he never denyed the combate." His resolute assertion of the Catholicity of the English Church, and his repudiation of the "Scottish Discipline," brought down upon him the attack of Robert Baillie, of Richard Baxter, and others. A chance meeting with Hobbes in 1645, in the Marquess of Newcastle's house at Paris, when they discussed

gave him assistance (Kennet, *Register and Chronicle* 861). On the other hand, the unexpected payment of a debt due to him enabled him to help many (Vesey, *Life*).

[1] He had correspondents on the continent who supplied him with the most recent works of continental scholars (e.g. *Rawdon Papers* 37).

[2] As he is called in his Epitaph (*Works* I. cxviii):

PAPISTICAE CALVINISTICAEQUE SUPERSTITIONIS,
SIMUL ET ATHEISMI, MALLEUS:
ROMAM ET GENEVAM SUBEGIT,
QUODQUE MAGIS HERCULEUM EST,
HOBBESIUM QUOVIS, VEL SUO, LEVIATHANE MONSTROSIOREM
PERDOMUIT.

the subject of Free Will and Necessity, led to the interchange of their views in writing, and ultimately to a smart encounter between them with regard to the whole system of the *Leviathan*[1]: and even bearing in mind the goodness of his cause, it speaks well for his powers that he acquits himself so successfully against so redoubtable a foe[2]. The writings against Hobbes, in spite of many tiresome digressions and an obsolete method, are well worthy of study still[3].

It would be tedious to review Bramhall's other writings in detail[4], since from the circumstances under which they were written they often go over the same ground. We will rather look at what he has to say on particular points.

1. And first, as to Roman Catholicism. Everybody who has studied the subject knows that the objections brought by Roman Catholics against the English Church are constantly changing. At that time the chief allegation was that we were guilty of schism[5] in what was done at the Reformation; and

[1] Bramhall's final discourse on the subject is entitled "The Catching of Leviathan or The Great Whale: demonstrating, out of Mr Hobbes his own works, that no man who is thoroughly a Hobbist can be a good Christian or a good Commonwealth's-man, or reconcile himself to himself; because his principles are not only destructive to all religion, but to all societies; extinguishing the relation between prince and subject, master and servant, parent and child, husband and wife, and abound with palpable contradictions."

[2] Prof. Croom Robertson observes that Bramhall's work "is worthy of being studied, not only as an effective statement of the view it advocates, but as a good specimen of scholastic fence" (*Hobbes* 165). The controversy is dealt with amongst others by Leibnitz in an appendix to his *Essais de Theodicée* (2nd ed. 1712), and by Dr J. H. Loewe, *John Bramhall und sein Verhältniss zu Thomas Hobbes*, Prag, 1887 (*Abhandlungen der Classe für Philosophie &c. der königl.-böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Folge vii, Band 1).

[3] Mr A. W. Haddan even expressed the opinion that "in this (as in nine-tenths of his other writings) Bramhall's fame would have stood higher had his opponent been more worthy of him" (*Works* vol. iv, preface).

[4] A good account of them is given by Haddan, his latest editor (*Works* I. xxvi. ff.). A collection of one hundred sermons which Bramhall had prepared for the press, together with some memoirs of his own life, were unfortunately "torne by the ratts before his death" (Vesey, *Life*). For other works now lost, see *Works* I. xxxiv.

[5] Sir George Radcliffe goes so far as to say, after much intercourse with Roman Catholics on the continent, that "The Schism is that only which is now the block between us" (*Rawdon Papers* 102). And Bramhall, when he passes on to such matters as Orders and Jurisdiction, says, "Their cannon is past; that which remains is but a small volley of musquets" (*Works* i. 269).

with this Bramhall deals in his *Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism* and elsewhere. He of course denies it absolutely: we have not separated ourselves, nor are we cut off from the Church Catholic[1]. "I presume this is one of the idiotisms (i.e. idioms) of your language," he says, "in which by the Church you always understand the Roman Church, making Roman and Catholic to be convertibles"[2]. But even so, it is not we who have made the breach: "we presume not to censure others to be out of the Church . . . we damn none for dissenting from us: we do not separate ourselves from other Churches, unless they chase us away with their censure, but only from their errors"[3]. "It was not we," he says again, "but the Court of Rome itself, that first separated England from the Church of Rome, by their unjust censures, excommunications, and interdictions"[4]. The Papacy is the real cause of the troubles of the Church: "It is your new Roman Creed that hath ruined the Faith: it is your Papal Court that hath ruined the Church"[5]. And even apart from abuses such as these, our repudiation of the papal authority at the Reformation was but the clearing away of what was in itself an encroachment, and a return to what was more truly Catholic[6]; for the Popes "did by degrees thrust in their sickle into the ecclesiastical affairs of England"[7].

Bramhall thus takes his place amongst the most thorough champions of the English Church. And yet, vigorous as he is, he never allows himself to go to the lengths to which many others did. He recognizes of course that the local Roman Church is truly part of the Catholic Church[8], and,

[1] *Works* i. 257; cf. i. 42 and ii. 257.

[2] Ibid. i. 42.

[3] Ibid. i. 197.

[4] Ibid. i. 257.

[5] Ibid. i. 41. As he points out elsewhere, it is the Roman Court which first allowed presbyters to ordain (ii. 71). And he has much to say of the differences amongst Roman Catholics, which, instead of being regarded as evils are by them honoured "with the title of scholastical questions" (ii. 68).

[6] "By how much our Church should make itself, as the case stands, more Roman than it is, by so much it should thereby become less Catholic than it is" (ibid. i. 257).

[7] Ibid. i. 131.

[8] Ibid. i. 43; ii. 55; iii. 518, &c.

like other great English divines, would be quite willing to give to the Papacy the honour which belongs to the primary see of Christendom, and which befits its illustrious history[1].

2. What does he say again, with regard to the general position of the English Church? He is, as we have seen, a strenuous champion of her catholicity[2]; but for that very reason he has a deep reverence for the Reformation, deeper than many who, living further away from the period, know less of the evils against which it was directed than he. It is Bramhall who, in speaking of the Reformation, compares the English Church to a garden, and says: "I make not the least doubt in the world that the Church of England before the Reformation, and the Church of England after the Reformation, are as much the same Church, as a garden before it be weeded and after it is weeded is the same garden; or a vine, before it be pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxurious branches, is one and the same vine"[3].

But although he is so loyal a son of the Reformation, he protests again and again that the cause of the English Church must not be confused with that of other "protestant churches." Few are so friendly towards them as he is, and yet he will have them kept quite apart from us. To one of his opponents, the titular bishop of Chalcedon, he replies: "My proposition was, that the Church of England is free from schism; he ever and anon enlargeth it to all Protestant Churches: and what or how many Churches he intendeth under that name and notion, I know not. Not that I censure any foreign Churches (with whose laws and liberties I am not so well acquainted as with our own); but because I conceive the case of the Church of England to be as clear as the sun at noon-day, and am not willing for the present to have it perplexed with heterogeneous disputes"[4]. When he comes

[1] *Works* i. 80; ii. 357, 495, 565, 613, 625; iii. 551.

[2] "Tenatious of the Catholic tradition," in Vesey's words.

[3] *Works* i. 113; cf. i. 41. Similar statements may be found in Hooker (*Ecclesiastical Polity* III. i. 12) and Bedell.

[4] *Works* ii. 42 f. Again, "Calvin saith, 'We have been forced to make a separation from all the world.' Admit he did say so, What, will he conclude from hence that the Church of England did the same? This conse-

to deal with particular doctrines, he does so with great learning and moderation, in a way which places him in the front rank of great English theologians; and if, like Laud and most of the Caroline divines, he sometimes seems to make the king the centre of everything, yet he is careful to teach that bishops do not "draw or derive any spiritual jurisdiction from the Crown"[1]: although in what is called "the application of the matter" the prince may have his part[2]. But the subject which he really makes his own is that of Anglican Orders, of which he is the most stalwart of all defenders[3]. He could not of course deal with objections which had not yet been invented; but within their own limits Bramhall's writings on this subject, which found an almost ideal editor in the late Mr A. W. Haddan, are still the best and most scholarly that we have; and no student of the subject can possibly ignore them.

3. What then has Bramhall to say with regard to the English Church in his own day, and its relations with the sects? It was easy for his opponents, as we have seen, to tell him that he was fighting for a shadow, and that what he called the English Church was really a thing of the past. But Bramhall had his answer ready. The Church, he allows, has been oppressed by Parliament, but not suppressed. "My adversary," he says, "is pleased to style it a 'dead' Church, and me 'the advocate of a dead Church';—even as the trees are dead in winter, when they want their leaves; or as the sun is set, when it is behind a cloud; or as the gold is destroyed, when it is melting in the furnace"[4]. Or again, "There was an Israelitish Church when Elias did

quence will never be made good without a transubstantiation of Mr Calvin into the English Church. He himself knoweth better,—that we honour Calvin for his excellent parts, but we do not pin our religion either in doctrine or discipline or liturgy to Calvin's sleeve" (ii. 62).

[1] *Works* i. 272. [2] Ibid. ii. 129.

[3] Dean Barwick had collected materials for a work on the subject; but hearing that Bramhall, "then an exile in Holland," was engaged upon it, "he readily left this Work to his Lordship's irrefragable Pen, furnishing him in the mean Time with Materials proper to end this Dispute" (P. Barwick, *Life of John Barwick*, London, 1724, p. 174).

[4] *Works* ii. 95.

not see it; but he must be as blind as Bartimaeus that cannot see the English Church . . . Do you make no difference between a Church persecuted and a Church extinguished? have patience, and expect the Catastrophe . . . If it please God, we may yet see the Church of England, which is now frying in the fire, come out like gold out of the furnace, more pure, more full of lustre. If not, His will be done. 'Just art thou, O Lord, and righteous are all thy judgments'"[1]. Truly, with sons of faith like this, the Church of England could not die.

4. But, his opponent might urge, You must acknowledge that at any rate the English Church has become tainted with sectarianism? No, replies Bramhall, "If the Church of England have joined in Sacraments and public prayers with schismatics, let him show it out of her Liturgy, or out of her Articles, or out of her Canons and Constitutions, for by these she speaks unto us; or let him show that any genuine son of hers by her injunction, or direction, or approbation, did ever communicate with schismatics; or that her principles are such as do justify or warrant schism, or lead men into a communion with schismatics: otherwise than thus a national Church cannot communicate with schismatics. If to make canons and constitutions against schismatics be to cherish them; if to punish their conventicles and clandestine meetings be to frequent them; if to oblige all her sons, who enter into Holy Orders, or are admitted to care of souls, to have no communion with them, be to communicate with them; then the Church of England is guilty of communicating with schismatics: or otherwise not.

"But I conceive that by the English Church he intends particular persons of our communion. If so, then, by his favour, he deserts the cause, and alters the state of the question. Let himself be judge, whether this consequence be good or not;—sundry English Protestants are lately turned Romish proselytes[2]; therefore the Church of England is

[1] *Works* i. 64.

[2] "Some indeed were so offended at the persecution that at this time befell the Church that they went over to *Rome* to fill their bellyes. Hunger is

turned Roman Catholic. A Church may be orthodox and Catholic, and yet certain within its communion be heretics or schismatics or both"[1].

5. We have already observed that Bramhall will not confound the case of the English Church with that of foreign reformed churches. And yet he will not go out of his way to condemn them. He holds indeed in the fullest way the reality of the divine origin of the episcopal office: "As for our parts, we believe Episcopacy to be at least an Apostolical institution, approved by Christ Himself in the Revelation, ordained in the infancy of Christianity as a remedy against schism; and we bless God that we have a clear succession of it"[2]. But he inclines favourably towards the Lutherans, who, as he says, "both assert Episcopacy in their Confessions, and have actual superintendents in their practice, and would have Bishops name and thing if it were in their power"[3]; and although he

a pinching argument and a great temptation, especially if the head be as empty as the stomach: but God be thanked, the number of the Apostates was not very great." So writes Bishop Vesey.

[1] *Works* ii. 48.

[2] Ibid. i. 271. One of his chief objections against the Papacy is that it is anti-episcopal: e.g. "Episcopal rights and papal claims are inconsistent" (ibid. iii. 529; cf. i. 252).

[3] *Works* iii. 517. Elsewhere he takes a more favourable view of their historical position: "The Lutherans . . . retained Bishops, name and thing, in the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark [Bramhall was doubtless not aware of the history of the Danish titular episcopate], and the thing under another name of Superintendents in Germany" (p. 532). Others, however, did not agree with him. Sir George Radcliffe writes to him on Mar. 20, 1643, "I am not altogether of your Lordship's mind for Bishops. I believe the superintendents in Germany have little of that order. A constant succession from the Apostles with sole power to give orders appropriate to them and none other (so as all other ordinations are not irregular only, but void), this makes a Bishop according to the practice of the Catholic Church, and the authority of the most ancient Councils. This our Bishops claim, and I believe no other church governors in the reformed churches; tho' otherwise in point of jurisdiction they have something like ours. But if I be not much mistaken, they receive not their degree by imposition of hands as ours do. I think nothing can make a Bishop, or a Priest, but authority from Heaven, without which all succession and ordinations are not only uncanonical, but mere nullities. . . But all this I say with submission to better judgments, as one who desires rather to learn than contest, and therefore

will not compromise his own heritage, rashly confounding it with that of others, he affirms once and again that we "unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own master"[1]. "We esteem them," he says, "as Churches not completely formed"[2]; "we are not so apt to censure whole Churches as the Romanists are"[3]. Bramhall even goes further on one occasion: "I know no reason why we should not admit Greeks and Lutherans to our communion, and . . . Armenians, Abyssenes, Muscovites, and all those who do profess the Apostolical Creed as it is expounded by the first four general Councils under the primitive discipline; and the Roman Catholics also, if they did not make their errors to be a condition of their communion"[4]. Words such as these are worth pondering. Bramhall of course may be right or wrong; but it ought to cause us searchings of heart if we find that our standard is narrower than that of our fathers.

V

As the period of exile went on the bishops began to die away; and Bramhall himself appears to have been ill towards the end[5]. Plans were formed for the consecration of new bishops by Bramhall[6]; and to obviate the fact that there were no chapters to elect them, he proposed that they should be

if I be in an error, I beseech your Lordship instruct and inform me" (*Rawdon Papers* 93).

[1] *Works* iii. 517; cf. i. 197.

[2] Ibid. ii. 69.

[3] Ibid. v. 258.

[4] Ibid. ii. 564.

[5] Hyde to Barwick, Sept. 14, 1659, "The Bishop of Derry . . . is infirm and cannot live long" (Barwick, *Life of John Barwick* 439). It was probably a paralytic stroke: he had a second in Jan. 166⅔ (Vesey, *Life*); and the third carried him off.

[6] "His Majesty therefore at last thought . . . to call over to him two of the remayning Bishops, who joyned to a worthy Praelate residing with him in his exile [*marg.* Bp Bramhall now L. Primate of Armach] might canonically consecrate some of those eminently deserving divines who then attended him; thus preserving the Order in a few, untill God gave opportunity to fill up the other vacancies" (Bishop H. King, *Sermon preached at the Funeral of Bp Duppa*, London, 1662, p. 42). Bishop King goes on to say that of the five bishops to whom the plan was brought, all but himself were too infirm to act; and so the project fell through.

nominated to sees in Ireland (where the election had fallen into abeyance before the sixteenth century) and then translated to England[1]. The Restoration, however, rendered this unnecessary; and Bramhall at once crossed to England, probably with the king[2]. The rehabilitation of the Irish Church was soon taken in hand, and Bramhall was almost immediately nominated Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland[3]. And on Jan. 27, 1661, in the words of Jeremy Taylor (who preached the sermon on the occasion), he "did, by an extraordinary contingency of Providence, in one day consecrate two archbishops and ten bishops"[4], thus restoring the Irish

[1] Hyde to Barwick, Brussels, July 8, 1859 (Barwick, *op. cit.* 424).

[2] He was at Westminster on June 15, 1660 (*S. P. Dom.*, Letter to Secretary Nicholas). Evelyn records, July 28, "I saluted my old friend the Archbishop of Armagh, formerly of Londonderry" (*Diary*, ed. Bray, 1852, i. 339). He appears to have gone to Yorkshire soon afterwards (before the election of Frewen as Archbishop of York, Sept. 22); for he ordained there by licence of the Dean and Chapter, amongst others one Micklethwait, who had previously received a presbyterian ordination (Vesey).

[3] It was publicly known by June 23, 1660, as appears by a letter of Sharp to Douglas (Kennet, *Register and Chronicle* 186). Amongst others who wrote congratulating him was Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, the daughter of James I (*Rawdon Papers* 118 n.).

[4] *Funeral Sermon* (*Works* I. lxxi). The Primate took care that all should be "grave and rightly performed" (Vesey). There is a full description of it by Dudley Loftus, *The Proceedings observed in Order to, and in the Consecration of, Twelve Bishops, at St Patrick's Church Dublin*, London, 1661; see also W. M. Mason, *History and Antiquities of St Patrick's Cathedral*, Dublin, 1820, pp. 192–4. The anthem sung on the occasion was as follows:

Treble.

Now that the Lord hath re-advanc'd the Crown;
Which Thirst of Spoyl, & frantick zeal threw down:

Tenor.

Now that the Lord the Miter hath restor'd
Which, with the Crown, lay in the dust abhor'd:

Treble. *Praise him ye kings,*
Tenor. *Praise him ye Priests,*
Chorus. *All Sing,*
Glory to Christ, our High Priest, Highest King.

Treble.

May Judah's *Royal Scepter still shine clear!*

Tenor.

May Aaron's *Holy Rod still Blossoms bear!*

hierarchy to its full strength. Not long afterwards, the Irish Lord Chancellor having been nominated as one of the Lords Justices for the government of the kingdom [1], Bramhall was appointed Speaker of the House of Lords, at their own desire [2]. In July, 1661, the charges which had been brought against him were expunged from the Rolls of both Houses of Parliament [3]; in the same month the Convocation of which he was president recorded its public and solemn recognition of his services [4]; and the following January a committee was appointed with a view of securing from the Crown some recognition of "his long and faithful service, and his great and many sufferings, from his Majesty; and also his zeal to the Protestant religion, in the late calamitous and afflicting times" [5]. In fact, during the last three years of his life he was undoubtedly more highly honoured than any other man in Ireland.

And they were years of no little activity. On his petition,

Treble and Tenor.

Scepter and Rod, Rule still, and Guide our Land!
And These whom God Anoints, feel no Rude hand,
May Love, Peace, Plenty wait on Throne and Chair,
And may both share in Blessings, as in Care.

Chorus.

Angels look down, and Joy to see
Like that above, a Monarchie.
Angels look down, and Joy to see
Like that above, a Hierarchie.

[1] Loftus, *Oratio Funebris* 36.

[2] A letter from the Earl of Orrery, who was one of the Lords Justices, to the Duke of Ormonde, dated March 6, 1661, enclosing that of the Peers on behalf of Bramhall, goes on to say that they "who have a like deep sense of his grace's eminent services and sufferings, and of his zeal for the protestant religion" endorse the request of the Peers (*Boyle State Papers*, ed. Morrice, London, 1742, p. 52). The Commission appointing him, dated March 8, is in the *Journal of the Irish House of Lords* i. 231. He received a vote of thanks for his services on July 31, 1662 (ibid. 325).

[3] *Commons' Journals* (Ireland) i. 681, July 16; *Lords' Journals* (Ireland) i. 274, July 30.

[4] See the extract from the Acts of Convocation given in Bramhall, *Works* I. cxiii. f.

[5] *Lords' Journals* (Ireland) i. 288, &c. It does not appear that anything was ever done: a letter of Lord Orrery's dealing with difficulties which were raised is given in the *Boyle State Papers* 55.

the king renewed the grant to the clergy of all tithes, impropriate and forfeited, which were in his possession; and other points of general administration were conceded not less readily. In Parliament, he exerted himself to procure the passing of two Church Acts[1]: one to extend the Ulster Tithing table to the whole of Ireland, and one to enable the bishops to let their land on long leases[2]. This latter might seem at first sight to be entirely contrary to his whole previous financial policy; and at length, on the arguments of Lord Orrery it was ultimately thrown out. Bramhall's object, however, it need hardly be said, was not self aggrandisement[3]; he had noticed that the tenants only cared to deplete farms which they held on short terms, and hoped to encourage them to improve their farms by allowing them longer leases[4].

In the Church at large he was not less active. Soon after the consecration of the twelve bishops he made a visitation of his diocese, where there were great disorders amongst the clergy; but "by lenity and reproof, by argument and perswasion, by long-suffering and Doctrin, he gained upon them even beyond his own hopes"[5]. Then followed a visitation of the whole province, and soon afterwards of the diocese of Meath *sede vacante*[6], where he also enthroned the new Bishop[7]. He again visited his own diocese early in 1663[8], and was projecting a visitation of the whole of Ireland, by royal licence, at the time of his death. In all these, although our evidence is scanty, it is clear that Bramhall set to work

[1] Carte, *Life of Ormonde* iv. 14; *Rawdon Papers* 169.

[2] Vesey, *Life.*

[3] "I know this, it was no advantage he proposed to himself that blinded his eyes, remembering to have heard him say, that most of his Lands were set out by his predecessor for a long time yet unexpired, and that he would fill them up to sixty years, without requiring any fine, that the Tenants might be encouraged to improve them" (ibid.).

[4] This had been in Bramhall's mind as early as 1634 (Laud, *Works* vii. 108).

[5] Vesey, *Life.* [6] Loftus, *Oratio funebris* 27, 31.

[7] Cotton, *Fasti* iii. 119.

[8] On this occasion, coming to Dundalk, he inquired where his predecessor, the great Archbishop FitzRalph, was buried, and resolved to erect a monument to his memory.

in a spirit of large-hearted moderation, so much so that he won the commendation of puritans, who compared him favourably even with Jeremy Taylor[1]. As Bishop Vesey wrote, "He had a great allowance & charity for men of different perswasions, looking upon those Churches as in a tottering condition that stood upon nice opinions. . . . And accordingly he is much celebrated for that distinction between *Articles* necessary for *Peace* and *Order*, and those that are necessary to *Salvation*. . . . And he hath often declared that the Church was not to be healed but by *General* propositions"[2]. Accordingly, when he was called upon to deal with irregular ministers, he showed a more conspicuous wisdom than many of his brethren did[3]. On his first visitation of his diocese, he readily gave a canonical institution and induction to the intruded ministers, provided that they were otherwise satisfactory: "But desiring to see their *Letters of Orders*, some had no other but their Certificats of ordination by some Presbyterian Classes, which he told them did not qualify them for any Preferment in the Church. Whereupon the Question immediately arose, *are we not Ministers of the Gospell*, to which his Grace answered, that was not the Question, at least he desired for Peace sake, of which he hopes they were ministers too, that that might not be the Question for that time. I dispute not, said he, the value of your Ordination, nor those Acts you have exercised by vertue of it, what you are, or might do here when there was no Law, or in other Churches abroade: but we are now to consider our selves as a *National Church* limited by Law, which among other things takes chiefe care to prescribe about *Ordination*: and I do not know how you could recover the means of the Church, if any should refuse to pay you your Tithes, if you are not ordained as the Law of this Church requireth. . . . By this means he gained such as were learned and sober, and for

[1] Reid, ed. Killen, ii. 278. [2] Vesey, *Life*.

[3] For example, Bishop Hall of Chester required of all who came to him an explicit renunciation of their presbyterian ordination, a requirement which naturally turned away many who would otherwise have conformed, including the saintly Philip Henry (see his life in Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Biography*, second edition, vi. 226).

the rest it was not much matter"[1]. In other words, here as elsewhere Bramhall recognized that the faith consists not in negations but in affirmations, and required all that the Church requires without going out of his way to condemn anybody or anything. Would that others had always been equally wise and equally charitable!

At the beginning of 1663 Bramhall had a second paralytic stroke, whereupon he at once began to set his house in order, making his Will[2] and providing so far as he could for the needs of his see. A partial recovery called forth fresh activity, but it was only transitory; and towards the end of June, during the hearing of a suit between Sir Audley Mervyn and his see (which was decided in Bramhall's favour), he was stricken down in court. He never recovered consciousness, and died a few days after, on June 25, 1663.

His actions and his writings show us the man. If we would know what he was to his own age, we may see it in Vesey's *Life*[3], in Loftus's *Funeral Sermon*[4], or above all in the words

[1] Vesey. He gives the speech, of course, merely from report; but Bramhall's position is even more clearly expressed in the clause (also given by Vesey) which he inserted in the Letters of Orders of those whom he ordained under these circumstances: "Non annihilantes priores Ordines (si quos habuit) nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes Ordines sacros Ecclesiarum Forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes, quicquid prius defuit per Canones Ecclesiae Anglicanae requisitum, et Providentes Paci Ecclesiae ut schismatis tollatur occasio, & conscientiis Fidelium satisfiat, nec ullo modo dubitent de eius Ordinatione, aut Actus suos Presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur."

[2] In his Will, signed Jan. 5, 166$\frac{2}{3}$, he thanks God for his having been born and bred in the English Church, "than which I doe not believe that the whole world hath any Church that cometh nearer to Apostolical truth, both in doctrine and discipline" (*Works* I. cviii).

[3] Vesey truly says, "Nor can any one Church in our dayes boast of the immediate succession of one so famous a Prelate to another" as Bramhall to Usher.

[4] Loftus also groups Usher and Bramhall together: "*Iacobus* nuper *Armachanus* in centenario Archiepiscoporum Armachanorum numero novissimum cepit locum, ut quod defuisset in suis predecessoribus, sua virtute compleret. Noster vero *Iohannes* supra numerum centenarium primus fuit constitutus, forsan ut in proximo centenario successuris Archiepiscopis luceret ipse tam Patricius alter in splendidissimum virtutis exemplar" (p. 26). Unfortunately, according to Cotton (*Fasti* iii. 20 f.), Usher was the ninety-sixth and Bramhall the ninety-seventh Archbishop of Armagh.

in which Jeremy Taylor sums up the character of his friend and leader: words glowing and eloquent, yet corresponding well with their subject: "To sum up all: he was a wise prelate, a learned doctor, a just man, a true friend, a great benefactor to others, a thankful beneficiary where he was obliged himself. He was a faithful servant to his masters, a loyal subject to the king, a zealous assertor of his religion against popery on one side, and fanaticism on the other. The practice of his religion was not so much in forms and exterior ministries, though he was a great observer of all the public rites and ministries of the Church, as it was in doing good for others. . . . It will be hard to find his equal in all things. . . . For in him were visible the great lines of Hooker's judiciousness, of Jewel's learning, of the acuteness of Bishop Andrewes. . . . But God hath taken our Elijah from our heads this day: I pray God that at least his mantle may be left behind, and that his spirit may be doubled upon his successor; and that we may all meet together with him at the right hand of the Lamb, where every man shall receive according to his deeds, whether they be good, or whether they be evil"[1].

[1] *Works* I. lxxiv ff.

VI

JEREMY TAYLOR

1613–1667

BY

H. HENSLEY HENSON, B.D.

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD
AND CANON OF WESTMINSTER

JEREMY TAYLOR

Jeremy Taylor was born at Cambridge in 1613: he belonged to the middle class of society, his father being a barber, an occupation more nearly approaching the dignity of a profession then than is now the case. He reckoned his descent from Rowland Taylor, whose "unblemished and attractive character" made him one of the most popular of the Protestant martyrs who suffered under Queen Mary. His father must have been a man of no mean education, for Jeremy Taylor, whose massive and various learning argues a very thorough education, has left on record that he was "solely grounded in grammar and mathematics" by him. It was the custom then for boys to matriculate at the University at a much earlier age than is now the case, and there is nothing unusual in the fact that Taylor was little more than thirteen years old when he was admitted a sizar of Gonville and Caius College, having previously for some while been one of "Minerva's darlings" in the free grammar school which had been newly founded in Cambridge by Mr Stephen Perse. He was successively scholar and fellow on the Perse foundation, took Holy Orders before the age of twenty-one, and proceeded to the Master's degree in 1633–4. He came to London and preached at St Paul's at the invitation of the divinity lecturer, Thomas Risden, with whom, according to the academic fashion of the time, he had shared his rooms in college. His preaching immediately attracted attention, and brought him under the notice of Laud, then newly advanced from London to Canterbury. The Archbishop summoned him to preach at Lambeth, and with that intuitive perception of

ability which perhaps was his most considerable quality, recognized his powers, and decided to rescue him from the danger attaching to their premature exercise. "His discourse," says Bishop Rust in the funeral sermon preached at his burial in 1667, "was beyond exception and beyond imitation: yet the wise prelate thought him too young: but the great youth humbly begged his grace to pardon that fault, and promised, if he lived, he would mend it. However, the grand patron of learning and ingenuity thought it for the advantage of the world that such mighty parts should be afforded better opportunities of study and improvement, than a course of constant preaching would allow of, and to that purpose he placed him in his own college of All Souls, in Oxford"[1].

Probably Laud was influenced by a twofold motive. On the one hand, he desired to save a promising young preacher from the perils of his own popularity: on the other hand, he wished to further his project of academic reform by introducing into All Souls College a genuine student. He achieved his purpose with characteristic contempt of law. Taylor, as a Cambridge man, only incorporated ten days before into the University of Oxford, was not legally eligible. The Warden, Sheldon, afterwards famous as Archbishop of Canterbury, vetoed Taylor's election. The appointment then devolved to the Visitor, Laud himself, who promptly appointed his own nominee, Jeremy Taylor. This was in November, 1636: a few months later Laud made him one of his chaplains, and, shortly after, he also became chaplain to the King. In 1638, Juxon, Bishop of London, presented him to the rectory of Uppingham in Rutlandshire, and a year later he married his first wife, Phoebe Langsdale. During these years he kept up an intermittent residence at Oxford, and attained some distinction as a casuistical preacher. It is not unworthy of notice that as a Fellow of All Souls, Taylor was within the latitudinarian influence which at that time was strong at Oxford. Chillingworth, a close friend of Warden Sheldon, was living hard by at Trinity, and though there is no evidence that he was intimate with Taylor, it is

[1] Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, ed. Heber, i. 16.

impossible that the two men could have been strangers. In 1637 Chillingworth published his famous book, *The Religion of Protestants*, and such a work "could scarcely be without effect on a mind so open and impressionable as Taylor's." It surely is not fanciful to trace the influence of Chillingworth in the most remarkable of all Taylor's compositions, *The Liberty of Prophesying*, which appeared just ten years later. At this time he appears to have been intimate with Christopher Davenport, better known by the name which he adopted as a Franciscan friar, Franciscus a Sancta Clara, who in 1634 had published a book, designed like Cardinal Newman's famous Tract XC, which was indeed based on it, to prove that the Thirty-nine Articles are not necessarily incompatible with the Roman doctrine. The book—*Deus, Natura, Gratia*—was dedicated to Charles I, and benevolently regarded by Archbishop Laud. His intimacy with this enterprising and energetic Franciscan brought upon Jeremy Taylor the suspicion of Romanizing proclivities, which he never wholly shook off, and which seemed to receive some probability from his marked tendency towards an ascetic devotion. Perhaps, in order to remove this suspicion, he seized the opportunity afforded by his appointment as Preacher to the University on November 5, 1638, to deliver a vigorous attack on Romanism as inherently treasonable, and therefore properly punished with severe penalties. This sermon was published with a dedication to Archbishop Laud. It is the first of the long series of Taylor's works. Hitherto his career had been marked by unbroken success: with the outbreak of the Civil War his troubles began. In 1642 he appears to have left his parish of Uppingham, which, however, was not sequestered until 1644. In the interval (1643) he was instituted to the rectory of Overstone in Northamptonshire, but he never resided in that parish, and in the next year (1644) joined the King's forces. His history for the next few years is by no means free from obscurity. He was taken prisoner in Wales in February, 1645, but soon released. Then he started a school in conjunction with William Nicholson and William Wyatt, living himself as domestic chaplain

in "Golden Grove," the seat of Richard Vaughan, second earl of Carbery, in whom he found a patron and a protector. Here he published his most famous works, the *Liberty of Prophesying* and the devotional treatises on *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*. He has made the name of his refuge immortal by appropriating it as the title of the fine collection of prayers, litanies, and instructions which he published in 1655.

He resided in Wales with occasional absences in London, where he was accustomed to go for business connected with the publication of his books, and where he sometimes preached to congregations of Royalists, until 1657. Twice he appears to have been imprisoned at Chepstow. It is said that, on the first occasion, the cause of his imprisonment was the Preface to the *Golden Grove*, in which he wrote with impolitic freedom about the state of religion. This Preface contains an excellent description of the state of affairs during the Commonwealth as it appeared to a devout Episcopalian. It also sets forward the motive which induced the author to exchange controversy for works of edification.

"In this sad declension of religion," he says, "the seers who are appointed to be the watchmen of the Church, cannot but observe that the supplanters and underminers are gone out, and are digging down the foundations; and having destroyed all public forms of ecclesiastical government, discountenanced an excellent Liturgy, taken off the hinges of unity, disgraced the articles of religion, polluted public assemblies, taken away all cognizance of schism, by mingling all sects, and giving countenance to that, against which all power ought to stand upon their guard:—there is now nothing left, but that we take care that men be Christians. For concerning the ornament and advantages of religion, we cannot make that provision we desire." Then follows a striking contrast between the ordered excellence of the ruined Church and the vicious anarchy of the victorious sects. "But now, instead of this excellency of condition and constitution of religion, the people are fallen under the harrows and saws of impertinent and ignorant preachers, who think all religion is a sermon,

and all sermons ought to be libels against truth and old governors—and expound chapters that the meaning may never be understood—and pray, that they may be thought able to talk, but not to hold their peace:—casting not to obtain anything but wealth and victory, power and plunder. And the people have reaped the fruits apt to grow upon such crabstocks: they grow idle and false, hypocrites and careless; they deny themselves nothing that is pleasant: they despise religion, forget government: and some never think of heaven: and they that do, think to go thither in such paths which all the ages of the Church did give men warning of, lest they should, that way, go to the devil." Then he dilates on the civil value of Episcopacy, perhaps with a view to commending the cause of the Church to Cromwell, who, as Protector, found himself in no small degree embarrassed by the incorrigible anarchy of the sects, who had raised him to power. "Nothing so combines with government, if it be of God's appointment, as the religion of the Church of England." Then he states the motive of his writing: "In the meantime, we must, by all means, secure the foundation, and take care that religion may be conveyed, in all its material parts, the same as it was, but by new and permitted instruments. For let us secure that our young men be good Christians: it is easy to make them good Protestants: unless they be abused with prejudice, and suck venom with their milk,—they cannot leave our communion till they have reason to reprove our doctrine."

Jeremy Taylor was the greatest of that little band of cultivated, learned, pious Anglicans who set themselves to the task of holding Churchmen together through the disastrous time when the public services of the Church were prohibited and Anglicanism was in the eyes of the existing government equivalent to disaffection. Bramhall, Thorndike, and Hammond were hardly less indefatigable: but the first was abroad, the second was hampered by an incorrigible pedantry, and the last did not possess the deep fervour and rich fancy of Taylor. The situation was indeed difficult and nearly desperate. The general cessation of public worship, and the enforced

absence or inactivity of a great number, including most of the more able and earnest of the clergy, endangered the constancy of the general multitude of Anglicans. The proselytizing agents of the Roman Church seized so favourable an opportunity for their efforts, and laboured with redoubled assiduity to detach men from the communion of a Church which seemed irrecoverably ruined. In his Epistle Dedicatory prefaced to his treatise on *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, published in 1654, Taylor writes with some feeling about the Roman proselytizers: "The emissaries of the Church of Rome are busy now to disturb the peace of consciences by troubling the persecuted, and ejecting scruples into the unfortunate, who suspect everything, and being weary of all, are most ready to change from the present. They have got a trick to ask, Where is our Church now? What is become of your Articles, of your religion? We cannot answer them as they can be answered: for nothing satisfies them, but being prosperous, and that we cannot pretend to, but upon the accounts of the Cross: and so we may indeed 'rejoice and be exceeding glad,' because we hope that 'great is our reward in heaven.' I wish that all tempted persons would consider the illogical deductions by which these men would impose upon their consciences: if the Church of England be destroyed, then transubstantiation is true: which indeed had concluded well, if that article had only pretended false, because the Church of England was prosperous. . . . . But though, blessed be God, our afflictions are great, yet we can and do enjoy the same religion, as the good Christians in the first three hundred years did theirs: we can serve God in our houses, and sometimes in churches: and our faith, which was not built upon temporal foundations, cannot be shaken by the convulsions of war and the changes of state." In the Epistle Dedicatory prefaced to the *Deus Justificatus*, published in 1656, Taylor gives a curious account of the methods by which the Presbyterians, who were so far the allies of Rome as to be themselves also engaged in the attack on the English Church, pushed

their hostility: "I know the arts of these men: and they often put me in mind of what was told me by Mr Sackville the late Earl of Dorset's uncle, that the cunning sects of the world (he named the Jesuits and the Presbyterians) did more prevail by whispering to ladies, than all the Church of England and the more sober Protestants could do by fine force and strength of argument. For they, by prejudice or fears, terrible things and zealous nothings, confident sayings and little stories, governing the ladies' consciences, who can persuade their lords, their lords will convert their tenants, and so the world is all their own." It is interesting to remember that Hooker, sixty years before, had made a similar charge against the Puritans of pushing their propaganda by a free use of feminine influence[1]. No doubt it was a time of trial, and the political confusions were not helpful to religion or morality: but, in reading the language of the defeated and sometimes persecuted Anglicans, we must remember that exasperation is rarely just and never accurate. As good a man as Jeremy Taylor, and one whose long life was almost throughout its course marked by hardship and oppression, I mean Richard Baxter, regarded the time of the Commonwealth as religiously and morally a great improvement on the period which preceded and that which followed it[2]. Both men were equally honest and equally mistaken. The discerning reader must discount their sincere but contradictory laments.

[1] *Eccl. Pol.*, Pref. iii. 13: "Some occasion is hereby ministered for men to think, that if the cause which is thus furthered did gain by the soundness of proof whereupon it doth build itself, it would not most busily endeavour to prevail where least ability of judgement is: and therefore, that this so eminent industry in making proselytes more of that sex than of the other groweth, for that they are deemed apter to serve as instruments and helps in the cause."

[2] Baxter, *Reformed Pastor*, pref. p. xvi: "And yet I must say (lest I be impiously blind and ungrateful), that through the great mercy of God, the matter is so far amended, that many hundred drunken, swearing, ignorant, negligent, scandalous ministers are cast out; and we have many humble, godly, painful teachers in a county for a few that we had before." P. xl: "And let me tell you, that for all the sins of the ministry which we have here confessed, the known world hath not a more able, faithful, godly ministry than Britain hath at this day." *Practical Works*, ed. Orme, vol. xiv.

Taylor left Wales in the spring of 1657: he had been visited by severe domestic trouble, which might well have disgusted a less sensitive man with the scene of his affliction. A visitation of the small-pox had carried off two of his sons, the children of his second wife. To this event he makes a pathetic allusion in a letter, addressed probably to Evelyn. He says that he has "passed through a great cloud which hath wetted me deeper than the skin. It hath pleased God to send the small-pox and fevers among my children: and I have, since I received your last, buried two sweet hopeful boys; and have now but one son left, whom I intend, if it please God, to bring up to London before Easter, and then I hope to wait upon you, and by your sweet conversation and other divertisements, if not to alleviate my sorrow, yet, at least, to entertain myself and keep me from too intense and actual thinkings of my trouble."

He carried out his purpose, and from March 1657 to June 1658 resided in London, where he is said to have regularly officiated as the minister of a small congregation of Episcopalian Royalists. Then he accepted from Lord Conway a weekly stipendiary lectureship at Lisburn in Antrim. "Cromwell furnished him with 'a pass and a protection for himself and his family under his sign manual and privy signet.' His residence was near Conway's splendid mansion at Portmore: he had also a study on Sallagh Island in Portmore Lough"[1].

Henceforward his home was in Ireland, and the history of the greatest Anglican of that time belongs to the Irish Church. He was engaged in putting the finishing touches to the great casuistic treatise *Ductor Dubitantium, or the Rule of Conscience*, which though the least popular of all his works, was that on which he bestowed most pains, and which he believed would be his principal title to the regard of posterity. This book was published in 1660, with a dedication to the newly-restored King. The motive, purpose, method, and scope of the work are set out in the Preface. He begins by pointing out that the circumstances of the Reformation had been

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography*, lv. 424.

unfavourable to the production of "books of conscience"; and that this deficiency had been made worse by "the careless and needless neglect of receiving private confessions." Thus the English clergy were very ill equipped for the performance of a very important part of their spiritual duty. "For any public provisions of books of casuistical theology we were almost wholly unprovided; and, like the children of Israel in the days of Saul and Jonathan, we were forced to go down to the forges of the Philistines to sharpen every man his share and his coulter, his axe and his mattock." But there were grave objections to using the casuistic resources of the Roman Church. "We cannot be well supplied out of the Roman storehouses: for though there the staple is, and very many excellent things exposed to view: yet we have found the merchants to be deceivers, and the wares too often falsified." He then proceeds to criticize the current Roman casuistry, pointing out its excessive detail, its unwholesome elaboration, its demoralizing distinctions, and its dangerous doctrine of authority. "I am ashamed of this heap of sad stories: if I should amass together what themselves have collected in their books, it would look like a libel: but who is pleased with variety of such sores, may enter into the hospitals themselves, and walk and look till he be weary." We are reminded as we read of the *Provinciales* of Pascal, which four years[1] before had created so great an impression in France, but, though Taylor refers generally to the controversy then raging in France, I find no conclusive evidence that he had read its most famous and only abiding literary product. He sums up his criticism of Roman casuistry in this caustic passage: "In conclusion, the effect of these uncertain principles and unsteady conduct of questions is this: that though by violence and force they have constrained and thrust their churches into a union of faith, like beasts into a pound, yet they have made their cases of conscience and the actions of their lives unstable as the face of the waters, and immeasurable as the dimensions of the moon: by which means their

[1] The first of the letters is dated "de Paris ce 23° janvier 1656," the eighteenth and last "du 24 Mars 1657."

confessors shall be enabled to answer according to every man's humour, and no man shall depart sad from their penitential chairs, and themselves shall take or give leave to anything: concerning which I refer the reader to the books and letters written by their parties of Port Royal, and to their own weak answers and vindications." Thus the Protestants having practically no "books of conscience," and the Roman Catholics only bad ones, "it was necessary that cases of conscience should be written over anew, and established upon better principles, and proceed in more sober and satisfying methods." This task he has put his hand to. He then explains his method, and his style of composition:

"I intend here to offer to the world a general instrument of moral theology, by the rules and measures of which, the guides of souls may determine the particulars that shall be brought before them: and those who love to inquire, may also find their duty so described, that unless their duties be complicated with laws, and civil customs, and secular interests, men that are wise may guide themselves in all their proportions of conscience: but if their case be indeed involved, they need the conduct of a spiritual guide, to untie the intrigue, and state the question, and apply the respective rules to the several parts of it: for though I have set them down all in their proper places relating to their several matters, yet when a question requires the reason of many rules, it is not every hand that can apply them: men will for ever need a living guide; and a wise guide of souls will, by some of these rules, be enabled to answer most cases that shall occur."

He protests with some warmth against the multiplication of rules, and points out that the individual conscience is embarrassed and not assisted by them. We catch an echo from his earlier and more famous treatise, *The Liberty of Prophesying*: "In what sect of Christianity soever any man is engaged, if he have an honest heart and a good conscience, though he be in darkness, he will find his way out, or grope his way within: he shall be guided or he shall be pardoned; God will pity him, and find some way for

his remedy; and if it be necessary, will bring him out." He ends with a protest against the ignorant volunteers, who posed as guides of conscience: "Now that the inquiries of conscience are so extremely numerous, men may be pleased to observe that theology is not every man's trade: and that it requires more wisdom and ability to take care of souls, than those men, who nowadays run under the formidable burden of the preacher's office, can bring from the places of their education, and first employment." I have given so large a place to *Ductor Dubitantium* because in some respects it is the most characteristic as it certainly is the most elaborate of Jeremy Taylor's compositions. We must now resume the thread of his history.

Among the divines to whom the Restoration brought peace and honour he stood out conspicuously. He had been in personal relation with the late King, to whom the not unnatural enthusiasm of the triumphant Cavaliers attributed a character little less than divine. Charles had desired his company as one of his chaplains during the last days of his life, and had given him as a dying gift his watch and a few jewels from the ebony case of his Bible. Jeremy Taylor had personally suffered by the sequestration of his preferments and repeated imprisonment. He had co-operated with Hammond in administering the money contributed by the wealthier Royalists for the relief of the dispossessed and destitute clergy. His writings had done more than anything else to keep men loyal to the ruined Church. He was personally popular among a numerous acquaintance. His claim to high promotion in the restored hierarchy was obvious and unquestioned. It was not too generously satisfied by his appointment to the Irish diocese of Down and Connor. That diocese was "the most infected of any with the most virulent and clamourous because the most ignorant of the sectaries." Carte in his *Life of Ormonde*[1] gives a lively description of the difficult situation in which the new Bishop found himself:

"The pulpits, filled with Scots Covenanters, rang with

[1] ii. 208: London, 1736.

nothing but warm exhortations to stand by the Covenant even unto blood, virulent invectives against the Bishop's person, and vehement harangues against Episcopacy and Liturgies. These were the only subject of their preachings for four months together, notwithstanding all the endeavours of that excellent man, who soon gained upon all the nobility and gentry (one only excepted) but still found the ministers implacable. He invited them to friendly conferences, desired earnestly to speak with them, went to them, sent some of their own sect to invite them, offered to satisfy them in anything that was reasonable, preached every Sunday amongst them somewhere or other, and courted them with the kindest offers. All the effect this had upon the ministers was, that it put them upon entering into a new covenant, to speak with no bishop, and to endure neither their government nor their persons: but it wrought very differently upon the better sort of people, who by these methods, and by the ministers having refused to dispute (to which their own followers urged them, and interpreted their declining to be ignorance and tergiversation), were so far gained, that the Bishop in less than two years found his diocese generally conformable."

That the Irish Presbyterians were not less obstinate and unreasonable than their Scottish co-religionists who resisted the appeals and thwarted the large-hearted designs of the saintly Leighton is not doubtful, but Jeremy Taylor seems to have decided to make no concessions on the subject of the validity of their Orders, on which they could not conscientiously yield, and which determined the legality of their position as incumbents. Their bigoted and intractable attitude strengthened him in his policy, while it disappointed and depressed him. He told Ormonde that he would rather "be a poor curate in a village church than a bishop over such intolerable persons." Only two of the Presbyterian ministers attended his first visitation: no less than thirty-six parishes were at once declared vacant because their incumbents had not received episcopal ordination. It is difficult to defend this severity. It "confirmed the Presbyterians in rebellion against his authority: intending the reverse, he did more

than any man to establish the loyal Presbyterians of the north of Ireland as a separate ecclesiastical body"[1].

As Vice-Chancellor of the University, Taylor had a great share in restoring order in Trinity College, and laid the foundation for its subsequent prosperity. One of the finest of his sermons, *Via intelligentiae*, was preached before "the little but excellent University of Dublin." In it he inveighs against the controversial habits of the time: "No, no; the man that is wise, he that is conducted by the Spirit of God,—knows better in what Christ's kingdom does consist, than to throw away his time and interest and peace and safety—for what? for religion? no: for the body of religion? no, not so much: for the garment of the body of religion? no, not for so much; but for the fringes of the garment of the body of religion: for such and no better are the disputes that trouble our discontented brethren: they are things, or rather circumstances and manners of things, in which the soul and spirit is not at all concerned"[2].

To the seven years of his episcopate belong several works, including one of the most remarkable and elaborate of all his compositions, I mean the *Dissuasive from Popery*, which he wrote at the request of the Irish hierarchy. The "preface to the reader" explains the circumstances under which this treatise was composed, and gives an extremely interesting account of the religious state of the Celtic population of Ireland. It is a melancholy evidence of the persistent perversity with which the affairs of that helpless nation were then, and for long afterwards, conducted, that Jeremy Taylor, one of the justest of men, who had himself pleaded for justice before the Irish Parliament of the Restoration, could accuse the Roman clergy for their use of the native tongue: "For the numerous companies of priests and friars amongst them take care they shall know nothing of religion, but what they design for them; they use all means to keep them to the use of the Irish tongue, lest, if they learn English, they might be supplied with persons fitter to instruct them: the people are taught to make that also their excuse for not coming to our

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography* lv. 426. [2] *Works* vi. 399.

churches, to hear our advices, or converse with us in religious intercourses, because they understood us not, and they will not understand us, neither will they learn that they may understand and live." There is something pathetic in the notion that the Irish, stripped of their property by an unparalleled series of confiscations, largely banished from their native townships to be cooped up in the desolate districts of the west, wounded in conscience and ruined in fortune, could be won to Protestantism and loyalty by an incisive, eloquent, learned philippic against their Church.

Allusion has already been made to the strained relations with his clergy which hindered Taylor's episcopal action. He was certainly very unhappy in his diocese, and made repeated efforts to obtain translation to a more congenial sphere. The Church at large has been more receptive of his pastoral counsels than the obstinate zealots to whom they were addressed, and no manual of pastoral work is complete which does not include his admirable *Rules and Advices to the Clergy*, and his sermons on "the whole duty of the clergy." These are very characteristic compositions. The combination of shrewd common sense and deep spiritual insight may, perhaps, be matched elsewhere, but surely no one but Jeremy Taylor would have embroidered practical advice with so many rhetorical touches and apt illustrations. His warnings against fanciful interpretations of Scripture are never superfluous, nor his insistence on the duty of clerical obedience to superiors, nor his condemnation of controversy. Let me content myself with a single quotation: "What good can come from that which fools begin, and wise men can never end but by silence? and that had been the best way at first, and would have stifled them in the cradle. What have your people to do whether Christ's body be in the Sacrament by consubstantiation, or transubstantiation; whether purgatory be in the centre of the earth, or in the air, or anywhere, or nowhere; and who but a madman would trouble their heads with the entangled links of the fantastic chain of predestination? Teach them to fear God and honour the King, to keep the commandments of God and the King's commands, because

of the oath of God: learn them to be sober and temperate, to be just and to pay their debts, to speak well of their neighbours and to think meanly of themselves: teach them charity and learn them to be zealous of good works. Is it not a shame that the people should be filled with sermons against ceremonies, and declamations against a surplice, and tedious harangues against the poor airy sign of the cross in baptism? These things teach them to be ignorant: it fills them with wind, and they suck dry nurses: it makes them lazy and useless, troublesome and good-for-nothing. Can the definition of a Christian be, that a Christian is a man that rails against bishops and the common Prayer-book? and yet this is the great labour of our neighbours that are crept in among us: this they call the work of the Lord, and this is the great matter of the desired reformation: in these things they spend their long breath, and about these things they spend earnest prayers, and by these they judge their brother, and for these they revile their superior, and in this doughty cause they think it fit to fight and die" [1].

Jeremy Taylor is not the only example our ecclesiastical history affords of a brilliant, versatile, learned bishop prematurely broken down by the relentless stupidity of fanaticism. In August, 1667, Jeremy Taylor died at the comparatively early age of fifty-five. He had consistently overworked himself. John Wesley, in his extremely sensible sermon on redeeming the time, says that Taylor considered three hours out of the twenty-four a sufficient provision for sleep. If the excellent bishop applied his theory to practice, it is no marvel that he did not reach old age.

Bishop Rust, in his funeral sermon, dwelt on the personal charm of his great predecessor. As it is the testimony of one who had been intimate with Taylor, we may quote it with advantage: "Nature had befriended him much in his constitution: for he was a person of most sweet and obliging humour, of great candour and ingenuity: and there was so much of salt and fineness of wit, and prettiness of address, in his familiar discourses, as made his conversation have all the pleasantness

[1] *Works* vi. 523.

of a comedy and all the usefulness of a sermon. His soul was made up of harmony; and he never spake but he charmed his hearer, not only with the clearness of his reason, but all his words, and his very tones and cadences, were strangely musical. . . . In his younger years he met with some assaults from popery, and the high pretensions of their religious orders were very accommodate to his devotional temper; but he was always so much master of himself, that he would never be governed by anything but reason, and the evidence of truth which engaged him in the study of those controversies; and to how good purpose, the world is by this time a sufficient witness: but the longer and the more he considered, the worse he liked the Roman cause, and became at last to censure them with some severity: but I confess I have so great an opinion of his judgement, and the charitableness of his spirit, that I am afraid he did not think worse of them than they deserve. . . .

"He was a person of great humility: and notwithstanding his stupendous parts and learning, and eminency of place, he had nothing in him of pride and humour, but was courteous and affable, and of easy access, and would lend a ready ear to the complaints, yea, to the impertinences of the meanest persons. His humility was coupled with an extraordinary piety, and, I believe, he spent the greatest part of his time in heaven: his solemn hours of prayer took up a considerable portion of his life, and we are not to doubt that he had learned of St Paul to pray continually: and that occasional ejaculations, and frequent aspirations and emigrations of his soul after God, made up the best part of his devotions. But he was not only a good man Godward, but he was come to the top of St Peter's gradation, and to all his other virtues added a large and diffusive charity: and whoever compares his plentiful incomes with the inconsiderable estate he left at his death, will be easily convinced that charity was steward for a great proportion of his revenue. But the hungry that he fed, and the naked that he clothed, and the distressed that he supplied, and the fatherless that he provided for, the poor children that he put to apprentice, and brought up at school,

and maintained at the university, will now sound a trumpet to that charity which he dispersed with his right hand, but would not suffer his left hand to have any knowledge of it. To sum up all in a few words: this great prelate had the good humour of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a counsellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint; he had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for a university, and wit enough for a college of virtuosi: and had his parts and endowments been parcelled out among his poor clergy that he left behind him, it would, perhaps, have made one of the best dioceses in the world"[1].

This is the language of a contemporary and a disciple. Something must be allowed for the generous partiality of the admirer, and something for the occasion of the judgement: but still it remains a very striking testimony to a singularly rich and versatile and attractive personality. Nor can it be justly said that the calmer verdict of posterity has reversed the sentence of Bishop Rust.

Jeremy Taylor is perhaps the most widely famed of all the Anglican divines. He appeals to so many distinct interests, and always with rare effectiveness. The rationalist and the ritualist can equally claim him, for he was himself both a distinguished Broad Churchman, as Bishop Thirlwall styled him[2], and a no less distinguished Anglo-Catholic of the Laudian school. He is the most contradictory and many-sided figure in the long gallery of great Anglicans. One of the earliest advocates of theological liberty, he was vehemently denounced by his contemporaries as an ecclesiastical persecutor; the chief of our anti-Roman controversialists, he was also the most sympathetic with ideas and practices which are commonly associated with the Roman Church; he was the author of the one considerable Anglican treatise on casuistry, and in great request as a confessor; he had always a hankering after asceticism, and there is a medieval ring about many

[1] *Works* i. 19, 22, 23.

[2] Thirlwall, *Essays*, ed. Perowne, p. 482.

of his spiritual counsels, which suggests the cloister of the twelfth century rather than the pulpit of the seventeenth; but he was twice married, a welcome figure in polite society, and evidently a man of deep domestic affections. Coleridge, we are assured, "placed Jeremy Taylor amongst the four great geniuses of old English literature," and "used to reckon Shakespeare and Bacon, Milton and Taylor four-square, each against each"[1], but he was no indiscriminating admirer of his works, and criticized his distinctive views on the once burning question of original sin with great severity. Of the *Deus Justificatus*, which he calls "the most eloquent work of this most eloquent of divines," he wrote this severe and characteristic judgement: "This most eloquent treatise may be compared to a statue of Janus, with the one face, which we must suppose fronting the Calvinistic tenet, entire and fresh, as from the master's hand; beaming with life and force, witty scorn on the lip, and a brow at once bright and weighty with satisfying reason:—the other, looking toward the 'something to be put in its place,' maimed, featureless, and weather-bitten into an almost visionary confusion and distinctness"[2]. Coleridge allowed the "wonderful eloquence and skill" of the *Liberty of Prophesying*, but the argument seemed to him to lead directly to the essentially popish position, that since opinions were so various and sects so many, there must be "some positive jurisdiction on earth, *ut sit finis controversiarum*"[3].

Principal Tulloch, while admitting the extraordinary gifts with which Taylor was endowed, and holding that "there are few names upon the whole which shine with a richer or a grander lustre than his," yet thought meanly of his intellectual power.

"Taylor is medieval, ascetic, casuistic in his mature type of thought. He is a scholastic in argument, a pietist in feeling, a poet in fancy and expression: he is not a thinker. He seldom moves in an atmosphere of purely rational light:

[1] *Table Talk* 91, note, 3rd edition.

[2] *Aids to Reflection* i. 224: London, 1848.

[3] *Table Talk* 92.

and even when his instincts are liberal and his reasoning highly rational in its results, he brings but a slight force of thought, of luminous and direct comprehension, to bear upon his work"[1].

Dr Marcus Dods in his short account of Jeremy Taylor in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* appears to take the same view. "His mind," he says, "was neither scientific nor speculative." With this view Bishop Heber, his sympathetic biographer and the editor of his collected works, also agrees. "As a reasoner I do not think him matchless. He is, indeed, always acute, and, in practical questions, almost always sensible. His knowledge was so vast, that on every point of discussion he set out with great advantage, as being familiar with all the necessary preliminaries of the question, and with every ground or argument which had been elicited on either side by former controversies. But his own understanding was rather inventive than critical. He never failed to find a plausible argument for any opinion which he himself entertained: he was as ready with plausible objections to every argument which might be advanced by his adversaries, and he was completely master of the whole detail of controversial attack and defence, and of every weapon of eloquence, irony, or sarcasm, which was most proper to persuade or silence. But his own views were sometimes indistinct, and often hasty"[2].

John Wesley in one of his sermons quotes a remarkable saying of Bishop Warburton, a person who, he justly observes, was not very prone to commend. That coarse and quarrelsome though learned and powerful divine used to say, "I have no conception of a greater genius on earth than Dr Jeremy Taylor"[3]. This is high praise, and yet it will not seem altogether extravagant to any student of Jeremy Taylor's multifarious works.

His learning was notable, even in that age of learned men. Bishop Heber enumerates more than nine hundred authors whom he cites by name. These include all the Greek and

[1] *Rational Theology in England* i. 347: London 1872.
[2] *Works* I. ccci: London, 1828.
[3] *Sermons* ii. 300.

Latin classic writers then accessible, the medieval casuists, the Church historians, the Greek and Latin Fathers, the Schoolmen, the continental theologians and controversialists, and his own contemporaries. The quotations are not always exact, and sometimes seriously inadequate. They cannot always be traced. These defects are easily explained by the difficult circumstances under which Jeremy Taylor commonly worked. He had to write at a distance from his books, amid the dangers and distractions of a civil war in which he was on the defeated side. His quotations are made spontaneously: they come without effort from a mind saturated with the ancient authors: they have been so completely assimilated as to become part of the very texture of thought, and thus they are handled and applied with the unrivalled liberty of an affluent and enterprising mind. This combination of profound and varied learning with the highest gifts of sympathy and rhetorical imagination is unique in our literature. Baxter, with whom it is natural to compare his great Anglican contemporary, was copious and learned, but he was self-taught, and self-centred in a degree which was never true of Jeremy Taylor. Yet the two men were in many respects curiously alike, and their literary activity ran in parallel channels. Both were variously eminent—as preachers, as controversialists, as theologians, as casuists, as devotional writers. Both were suspected of doctrinal laxity by the rigorists of their time. Both stood conspicuously outside the party grooves of ecclesiastical politics. Both have left on record eloquent pleas for a wider tolerance of theological views than to that generation seemed either reasonable or religious. Both have been accused of inconsistency as men whose intolerant practice contradicted their generous theories. Both, we may add, laboured under the delusion that they were poets, and have left behind them verses which serve to point the truth which is too often forgotten, that there is no real connexion between the highest rhetorical excellence and the poetic gift. The differences between the two men were sufficiently obvious. Taylor had been reared in the best Anglican school: his earliest im-

pressions of the English Church were eminently favourable. He had only known the hierarchy at its best—in the University of Oxford, at Lambeth, where he had seen his patron, Archbishop Laud, labouring for the restoration of what he conceived to be the primitive discipline, at the court of the pious and cultivated Charles. Anglicanism in his mind was associated with learning, order, and piety: he judged the Puritan movement from the standpoint of one of its victims, and always saw it through the murky medium of a natural and undying resentment. He disliked it as a gentleman, despised it as a scholar, abhorred it as a Churchman. Everything of Jeremy Taylor's suggests the courtier and the academic as well as the ecclesiastic and the saint. Baxter's childhood and youth were unfortunately ordered. He saw the Church at its worst, and was forced to link together the notions of moral laxity and hierarchic government[1].

[1] Baxter, *Autobiography*, ed. Sylvester, London, 1696, p. 1: "We lived in a country that had but little preaching at all: in the village where I was born there was four readers successively in six years' time, ignorant men, and two of them immoral in their lives; who were all my schoolmasters. In the village where my father lived, there was a reader of about eighty years of age that never preached, and had two churches about twenty miles distant: his eyesight failing him, he said Common Prayer without book; but for the reading of the Psalms and chapters, he got a common thresher and day-labourer one year, and a taylor another year (for the Clerk could not read well): and at last he had a kinsman of his own (the excellentest stage-player in all the country, and a good gamester and a good fellow) that got Orders and supplied one of his places. After him another younger kinsman, that could write and read, got Orders: and at the same time another neighbour's son that had been awhile at school turn'd minister, and who would needs go further than the rest, ventured to preach (and after got a living in Staffordshire), and when he had been a preacher about twelve or sixteen years, he was fain to give over, it being discovered that his Orders were forged by the first ingenious stage-player. After him another neighbour's son took Orders, when he had been awhile an attorney's clerk, and a common drunkard, and tipled himself into so great poverty that he had no other way to live: it was feared that he and more of them came by their Orders the same way with the forementioned person: these were the schoolmasters of my youth (except two of them): who read Common Prayer on Sundays and Holydays, and taught school and tipled on the weekdays, and whipt the boys when they were drunk, so that we changed them very oft. Within a few miles about us were near a dozen more ministers that were near eighty years old apiece, and never preached: poor ignorant readers and most of them of scandalous lives: only three or four

His conscience was permanently alienated from the Episcopal system. His wide reading prohibited in his case the ignorant violence which marked the general body of Puritans. He approved and was prepared to accept such an Episcopacy as he thought had existed in the early Church, and such as he found set out by the massive and cautious learning of Archbishop Usher. His singularly honest and practical nature revolted against the vicious sophistries and deluding self-confidence of the numerous enthusiasts who, in the general anarchy, exhibited the too-familiar combination of overweening spiritual vanity and flagitious living. He had no natural dependence on any system: he had no teachers of his youth, whom he regarded with veneration. Most of them, indeed, were undeserving men, whom he despised. Books were his chief teachers: and, for the rest, he worked out his conclusions for himself and went his own way. He was not a conceited man naturally, certainly not an obstinate or quarrelsome man; his whole career proves him to have been singularly honest and teachable, but he had a solitary childhood and youth, and in manhood his health and the wayward course of affairs had largely exiled him from his fellows: and he could not take things lightly or play the diplomatist on equal terms with his contemporaries. Thus he was continually exposing himself to the accusation of self-importance, and, if his contemporaries treated him unworthily and misunderstood him cruelly, they were not altogether without excuse. It is remarkable that two men, so prominent and in many respects so similar, should apparently have had no dealings with one another. Baxter was not averse to intercourse with Episcopalian divines. He enjoyed the friendship of Archbishop Usher, and was on terms of friendly acquaintance with the more moderate of the Caroline prelates. Of Sanderson, Pearson, and Hammond

constant competent preachers lived near us, and those (though conformable all save one) were the common marks of the people's obloquy and reproach, and any that had but gone to hear them, when he had no preaching at home, was made the derision of the vulgar rabble, under the odious name of a Puritan."

he speaks with great respect, but, so far as I am acquainted with his writings, there is little more than a brief reference to the most famous of the Restoration divines. Taylor on his part, so far as I know, never refers to Baxter. This mutual ignorance is the more surprising in view of the fact that Taylor and Baxter were almost at the same time urging the same unpopular cause of doctrinal toleration. The *Liberty of Prophesying* was published in 1647: the first edition of the *Saint's Rest* appeared in 1649, and the second, with numerous notes and references, in 1651. In neither edition does Baxter make any reference to the famous treatise of his Anglican contemporary. At the Restoration we might have expected that the Nonconformist clergy would have eagerly pleaded the authority of a writer so generally admired by Episcopalians, who had so earnestly pleaded the cause of toleration: but in fact they do not seem to have done so: and the charge of inconsistency which has been brought, with scant justice, against the eloquent bishop appears to be modern. Baxter is no longer read even by devout Nonconformists: even the *Saint's Rest*, unquestionably the most popular of his writings, which passed through many editions in its author's lifetime, has been mainly known in an abridgement during the last 150 years, and is now probably hardly known at all. Jeremy Taylor, on the other hand, still maintains his place in the usage of religious Anglicans. The extraordinary richness of his style, instinct everywhere with a subtle sympathy, and always marked by a saneness of judgement and a wholeness of view which are not common features of devotional literature in any age, give to his compositions an attractiveness possessed by scarcely any other writings of that time. Sanderson, and even Hammond, is no longer read: Chillingworth and Stillingfleet are totally obsolete. Leighton, alone, perhaps retains a similar hold with Jeremy Taylor on the attention of Anglican readers. He presents the same combination of rhetorical beauty and spiritual insight. But Leighton was the least and Jeremy Taylor one of the most prolific writers of that age. The saintly Archbishop "printed nothing during his lifetime, and

gave directions that his manuscripts should not be published, but his sister gave them to the world, and they have ever since had a wonderful charm for the lovers of piety and learning, and those in all communions who are most competent to judge of their excellence"[1].

Leighton's literary fame rests on his *Commentary on St Peter's Epistle*, and on a few sermons and addresses. Jeremy Taylor's first work, the Gunpowder Treason Sermon, was published in 1638, his last, *A Dissuasive from Popery*, in 1664. In the twenty-six years of his literary activity he published no less than thirty-two separate works, including such lengthy compositions as *The Great Exemplar* and *Ductor Dubitantium*. Thus in the range and quantity of his work he was greatly superior to Leighton, and in quality he was not inferior. Alone of his contemporaries he remains, after a lapse of nearly 250 years, a living influence on religious thought and action. It would be impossible to discover any weightier evidence of his transcendent merit.

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography* xxxiii. 6.

VII

GILBERT BURNET

1643–1715

BY

H. W. C. DAVIS, M.A.

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL

GILBERT BURNET

To form a just idea of Burnet's personality [1] is not a simple matter. On this subject his contemporaries contradict themselves and one another. Nor are these inconsistencies entirely due to party feeling. He was the type of principles which some revered and others loathed, which no one of that day could regard with perfect equanimity; it was inevitable that the individual should be frequently forgotten in the type. But, when we have allowed for this, the fact remains that Burnet was despised by not a few of his own party, while those who had no sympathy with his principles often felt a liking for the man. Indeed the great and the grotesque were so fantastically blended in his nature, that one can hardly speak of him except in epigrams. At one moment

[1] *Bibliography.* The chief authorities which we have cited are (1) *Manuscript*: the Autobiography on which the printed Life by Thomas Burnet is based (Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 24), a volume of letters and papers formerly in the possession of the Burnet family (Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23), and some scattered letters and papers among the MSS. of the British Museum. (2) *Printed*: the *Life* by Thomas Burnet; the Bishop's *History of his Own Times* (the Oxford edition of 1833, and Mr Airy's edition: the latter ends with the death of Charles II); a number of scattered Letters in the Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission; the *Lauderdale Papers* in Mr Airy's selection; the appendix on Burnet in the sixth volume of von Ranke's *History of England* (English translation); Mr Pocock's introductions to his edition of the *History of the Reformation*; of pamphlets, Burnet's own *Reflections on a Pamphlet* (1696), Cockburn's *Specimen*, Higgons's *Historical and Critical Remarks* (1727), Elliot's *Specimen*. Of Burnet's theological writings I have used chiefly the *Vindication of the Authority of the Church and State of Scotland*, the *Rational Method for proving the Truth of the Christian Religion*, the *Pastoral Care*, and the *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*. His occasional sermons, and the pamphlets which he wrote in the years 1687–9, are often valuable as an index to his political opinions.

we are repelled, at another he reduces us to laughter; and yet we can hardly fail to end by admiring him.

If we put the opinion of contemporaries on one side, and study the man in his own writings, we find ourselves in possession of abundant materials on which to form a judgement, but not much nearer to a judgement than before. It becomes intelligible that he should command the friendship of men so widely different as Leighton and Rochester, Halifax and Tillotson; that Charles II should honour him with a contemptuous hatred, and William III with a contemptuous esteem; that the Whigs of the middle-classes should regard him as a prophet, and that the very mention of his name should arouse in Swift a savage loathing and contempt, not entirely due to divergencies of principle. Evidently, it will be said, he was a many-sided man, living in a one-sided generation, not more than partially appreciated by any single witness: piece together all these partial views, and the entire man will be revealed. But to piece them together and to fix their relative importance is not so simple. Of one thing however we may be certain. Burnet was an honest man. To convict him of verbal inconsistencies would not be difficult; his instincts were sounder than his logic; the premises by which he defended his conclusions were frequently ill chosen and sometimes capable of being turned against him with effect. More than this, he changed his party in the middle of his career. In early life he placed his pen at the disposal of Lauderdale and Charles II; he abandoned them to become the friend of Russell and the most popular apologist of the Revolution. But the inconsistency of conduct is as superficial as the inconsistency of words. Burnet was a Churchman first, and a politician afterwards. He attached himself to two parties in succession: but he identified himself with neither. For constitutional principles he cared little; if the King would endorse the Church policy on which Burnet's heart was set, then he was with the King; if the King declared against the Church, then Burnet would make a shift to work with Parliament and the Prince of Orange. He followed ideals which were religious rather than political; for their sake he had

to work with men to whom religion was a secondary consideration. He understood his allies: if they failed to understand him and the nature of the tie which bound him to them, the fault lay, not in his duplicity, but in the cynicism which blinded them to all motives of a higher nature than their own. That he was vain, his warmest defenders will not venture to deny; that he was ambitious, he himself has left on record [1]. But both the vanity and the ambition were innocent, even laudable. To be of service in his generation and to have his services acknowledged in his lifetime is not the highest aim a man can set before him, nor was it the sole aim of Burnet: but it is distinctly to his credit that this aim was seldom absent from his mind. Honours, rewards, the shows of power, were nothing in his eyes. He coveted the imponderable influence which belongs to a leader of opinion; and he did so because he felt that he had a message to convey.

It is as a leader of opinion that I shall ask you to consider Burnet. He thought himself a man of action, but in moments of action he always presented a rather ludicrous appearance. Of this we might be sure from his own confession, even though Swift and Dartmouth and a host of minor detractors had not taken pains to emphasize the fact. He was thrown by the irony of fate among the most consummate statesmen and the most astute intriguers of an age in which intrigue and statesmanship were carried to the furthest limits of refinement. That from such acquaintances he should glean a little of the serpent's wisdom was inevitable. It was however very little that he gleaned. To judge correctly he had need of elbow-room and leisure. An excellent critic after the event, he was often grossly at fault in his first impressions of a man or a situation. There were occasions when he was extraordinarily tactless and obtuse, when it seemed as if satire could not prick and rebuffs could not abash him. Asked or unasked he was always ready with advice, and with offers of assistance in the tasks for which he was least fitted. If then we measured Burnet, as he would have liked us to

[1] "Vain and desirous of fame beyond expression" is the character which he gives of himself at the age of twenty-five (MS. Aut. fo. 201).

measure him, by the figure which he made in councils, camps and drawing-rooms, we should dismiss him with contemptuous praise, as the Boswell of the Revolution.

Yet Boswell had a touch of genius and Burnet was a greater man than Boswell. If Boswell has drawn for us an inimitable picture of an individual genius, Burnet's voluminous sermons, treatises, and histories sum up the sanest and most wholesome thoughts of an entire generation. Ridiculous as he might be in certain aspects, he expressed, and in expressing vitalized, the convictions of the dominant party in the nation at an important crisis. It was thus that he established his position, and thus that he compelled the greatest of his contemporaries to treat him with consideration. Original he seldom showed himself. But he assimilated ordinary ideas more completely and perceived their practical corollaries more promptly than the ordinary run of men. Some were decided in their policy by his example. Others were won over by his arguments. For he had the art of framing arguments of the kind which his audience expected and appreciated. To an impartial mind his pleading might at times seem confused or sophistical, or both. At the worst it had the merit of a vehemence and sincerity which carried greater weight with the average English mind than all the rules and canons of the syllogism. Burnet's intellectual ascendency was due much more to moral than intellectual qualities.

But Burnet's moral qualities were such as postulate an active and a sympathetic, though not perhaps a subtle or creative intellect. He could appreciate the finest shades of spiritual worth behind unpromising exteriors and even in a hostile camp. He had a high and fearless spirit, quick to see and quicker to resent injustice or oppression. No friend was ever more devoted, no counsellor more single-minded; we may add that few cases can be produced of greater constancy to an ideal or of greater energy in pursuing it. Burnet's energy was superhuman. Apart from literary work his life was that of a busy man; but there were few days of which he failed to spend five or six hours in his study, and many when he was at work for twice as long as this.

And he always worked at a white heat. The *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles* was written in twelve months. The materials for the second volume of the *History of the Reformation* were collected in two years; its composition occupied him just six weeks.

Many as were the slips and the shortcomings which resulted from this amazing rapidity of production, there is something impressive in the intensity of the purpose which carried him along. He is often inaccurate, but never tame; he may leave the details of his plan unfinished, but he does not lose sight of the wood among the trees; his reflections may be lacking in profundity, but they are full of a vigorous common-sense. He writes as one who is profoundly interested, and rarely fails to interest his readers. In the lighter graces of literary form he is conspicuously wanting; there is some justice in Swift's stricture on "that peculiar method of expressing himself which the poverty of our language forces me to call his style." But what is lost in polish is gained in the easy flow of thought, the naturalness of arrangement, the homely vividness of narrative and illustration which he could not have preserved had he written more laboriously. Tillotson and Stillingfleet excelled him in the polish of their style; those who desire to have the ideas of the Revolution stated in a philosophic form will certainly prefer to read John Locke. But Burnet's writings were and are more influential than even those of Locke. It may of course be argued that he was more popular because he shared in prejudices to which his rivals were superior. This would account for the vogue which he enjoyed in his own lifetime. It will not explain the preference of posterity. The fact is, that while few of the ideas which he propounded were peculiar to himself, he was possessed by them more thoroughly than other writers of his time; he had the genius, along with the defects, of the great advocate. There was in him a fire which his rivals lacked. And while the principles of the Whig Revolution and the Latitudinarians have any hold upon the English mind, they will be studied in the works of Burnet.

Burnet's writings, and the importance which they gained

for him, can hardly be understood without some knowledge of his life; the best of them being, as we have implied, occasional in character. Therefore no apology is needed for describing the circumstances under which his opinions formed themselves, and the situations in the midst of which they were expressed. It will be necessary to do this in considerable detail owing to the fact that Gilbert Burnet's political career has been severely criticized by hostile pamphleteers, and their charges, if accepted, would lead us to a conception of his character much less favourable than that which I have indicated. As a politician Burnet committed many indiscretions for which he may be justly blamed, but his faults were of the head, not of the heart. He was sometimes foolish, never dishonest or a sycophant. Had he been the unscrupulous adventurer which his enemies would have us think him, he would not have waited for preferment till the Revolution; the last two Stuarts would not have marked him out as the victim of a petty persecution; and in the hour of his party's triumph he would have followed a line of policy very different from that in which he actually persisted to the end of his career[1].

Burnet's public life contains three periods, which are distinguished from one another not so much by changes in his opinions as by changes in his political connexions. Like Halifax he was a trimmer. But while Halifax trimmed in the interests of the established Constitution, Burnet trimmed in the interests of the established Church. Hence the two friends, though united by a broad and general similarity of views, were rarely to be found in absolute agreement, and were sometimes upon different sides. Burnet, in his first period, acted as a confidential agent for the Court in the ecclesiastical politics of Scotland. For the next ten years, his pen was at the service of the Opposition in the English Parliament. He became the friend of Essex and Russell, he denounced Lauderdale, he was conspicuous in the agitation for the exclusion of the Duke of York. Finally after 1685,

[1] This is the line adopted by himself in a letter to an anonymous detractor (Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 37).

he identified himself with the interests of the House of Orange, and thenceforth steered a middle course between the two English parties with which he had been successively connected. To explain these migrations from camp to camp must be the chief concern of his biographer.

A second question of some interest is that of his importance as a factor in contemporary politics. The difficulty is that Burnet himself has been hitherto, and is likely to remain, our principal witness on this question. We cannot even take the evidence of his son as an independent source. For when Thomas Burnet wrote his father's life he merely adapted and expanded an Autobiography written by the Bishop towards the end of his life[1]. Fortunately we have no reason to distrust the veracity of Gilbert Burnet. From secondary sources we are able to prove that many statements, which a suspicious reader of the *History of his Own Times* might stigmatize as the fabrications of an overweening vanity, are substantially correct. Burnet, if used with caution, if we distinguish between what he saw and what he merely heard, between his positive statements and his guesses, is a tolerably safe guide. Even his self-complacency is less obtrusive in his writings than in his active life; both in the *History of his Own Times* and in the unprinted Autobiography he shows that he could be a censorious critic of his own past.

Burnet was born[2] at Edinburgh on Sept. 18, 1643, two years after the party of the Covenant had established their ascendency in Scotland; and he grew to manhood under the rule of the Protectorate, in the midst of Presbyterian influences. His mother was a sister of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warristoun, a leading man among the Covenanters; and she was imbued with the convictions of her brother. But

[1] It was completed in Nov. 1710 (MS. Aut. fo. 218).

[2] The biographical facts which follow are taken in most cases from the *Life* by Thomas Burnet. Where other facts of importance have been introduced their source is indicated in the notes. The dates given in the MS. Autobiography sometimes differ slightly from those adopted by Thomas Burnet. In such cases I have followed the authority of the latter, as the corrections seem to be intentional.

the family into which she had married belonged to Aberdeenshire, the one part of Scotland in which Episcopalianism had taken root; and her husband, William Burnet, a distinguished lawyer, a man of conspicuous moderation and integrity, was one of the few Scotchmen who offered a conscientious and consistent opposition to the Covenant. Fully alive to the abuses which had thriven under the shadow of the Scotch Episcopate, he was still opposed to its total abolition. The influence of his brother-in-law saved him from the worst consequence of recalcitrance[1]; but he was exiled three several times, and on one of these occasions remained five years abroad. When at length permitted to return he refused the most liberal offers which Cromwell, who knew his worth and would have liked to purchase his support, could offer. He lived in privacy upon his Aberdeen estate until the Restoration, when his fidelity to Church and King received its due reward; he became in 1661 one of the Lords of the Session, with the title of Lord Crimond.

A few months afterwards he died; but he had lived long enough to stamp his own views upon the impressionable nature of young Gilbert Burnet. The boy's education had been for some years the chief employment of his father. Before he was ten years old Gilbert Burnet had attained, under this tuition, to a surprising proficiency in Latin. When in 1653[2] he entered at the Marischal College, Aberdeen, his father still supervised his reading[3]. Proud of his son's ability, William Burnet may have done too much to stimulate a naturally precocious intellect. But to his father Gilbert owed the habit of unremitting industry which stood him in good stead long after he had lost the conceit of an infant prodigy. At fourteen years of age he graduated, and was left

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 197.

[2] *Records of Marischal College* (New Spalding Club), ii. 219–20, give the date of his matriculation as Oct. 1653, of his graduation as June 1657. The same volume contains a copy of a portrait now in the possession of the University of Aberdeen.

[3] MS. Aut. fo. 196. His father made him read every day from four till ten in the morning. "He perhaps loaded me with too much knowledge, for I was excessively vain of it."

to choose his own profession. He aspired to become an advocate, thinking that a brilliant success was assured him by his family connexions [1]. But a year of legal studies converted him from this ambition and, to the great joy of his father, he decided upon taking Orders. At the moment of his father's death he had passed the Trials of a divinity probationer, but was not yet irrevocably committed, and his mother's family made a last attempt to keep him from a connexion with the restored Episcopalian system, by reviving his old inclination for the bar. Undoubtedly the bar had greater prizes to offer than the Church. But Burnet resisted the temptation to which he had so nearly succumbed a year or two before. It was not the prospect of security and ease which held him to his purpose. He was anxious to escape, as completely as he could, from contact with the intolerance, the narrow metaphysics, the sour enthusiasm of the Presbyterians. He respected them, but in their confined atmosphere he choked for want of air and space. His reading and the friendships which he had contracted gave him reason to expect that among the adherents of Episcopacy he would find a more liberal type of intellect, a larger charity, a higher flight of spiritual aspiration. In Presbyterianism, he complained, there was much honest devotion to a narrow code of conduct, but no sublimity or elevation of character or thought [2]. In this opinion he was confirmed by three years of reading, diversified with pilgrimages to the leading centres of Protestant thought. He studied the works of Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, without much comprehension of that author's fanciful idealism, but with a growing delight in the spirit of tolerance, the contempt for forms and verbal definitions, which still lend a charm to More's recondite disquisitions. The sonorous eloquence of Hooker fired him with a new enthusiasm for Episcopacy as a system of Church governance. Hooker sent him to the original authorities for the history and constitution of the primitive Church. He became convinced that Episcopacy could be vindicated both on grounds of history and on those of natural reason. But he also learned

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 196. [2] MS. Aut. fo. 198; Airy, i. 271.

to think of less worthy systems as permissible; and to realize that in primitive Christianity all questions of ritual and organization were treated as of secondary importance; that the beliefs then regarded as fundamental were few and simple in their character; that the greatest of the fathers had paid much more attention to practical duties and the inner life than to verbal definitions[1]. In short, the lessons which his historical insight enabled him to learn from the records of the early Church combined with his natural aversion from metaphysics to set him on the road towards the Latitudinarian position. In this tendency he was confirmed by the teaching of the saintly Bishop Leighton, whose acquaintance he had formed in 1662. "He raised me to a just sense of the great end of Religion as a divine life in the soul that carries a man far above forms or opinions"[2]. Hard things have been said of the Episcopal Church of Scotland; but one cannot read what Burnet tells us of the teaching which influenced him in this critical period, the teaching of such men as Leighton, Nairn, and Charteris, without feeling that if it contained no men of the first eminence it was the finest nursery for a strong intellect which we can well imagine. There was tolerance, there was breadth of mind, and sympathy with scientific thought and metaphysics: but above all a quiet intensity of spiritual life which the most sceptical and careless could not avoid respecting, which kindled and uplifted the minds of all who approached it in the spirit of disciples.

But Burnet's education did not end, as it began, on Scottish soil. In 1663 he spent six months in England, partly in London, partly at the Universities. In Cambridge he met with Cudworth and with Pearson, and was entranced by the magic of Henry More's familiar conversation; at Oxford he had the opportunity of admiring Pocock's erudition and the stately courtesy of Dr Fell. But he was disappointed with the Universities. He found in them a little culture almost buried from view beneath general indifference to intellectual

[1] Airy, i. 385.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 198. Cf. the character of Leighton in Airy, i. 239.

pursuits; a few friends of toleration powerless among a majority of stupid bigots[1]. London answered more nearly to his expectations. There he formed the acquaintance of many leading Anglican divines. His knowledge of Church history commended him to Wilkins's notice; the breadth of his opinions won for him the friendship of Tillotson and Stillingfleet, who were then the rising stars among the London clergy. Nor did he confine himself to conversing with those of the Established Church. He was much at the house of Baxter, whose works he had studied and admired in Scotland; and he found himself on most questions of importance surprisingly in agreement with that great non-conformist. But he thought that Baxter was too credulous, and too easily influenced by the satellites who clustered round him[2]. Although both now and later Burnet made many friends among the English non-conformists, he was never attracted by their intellectual position; and never wavered in his attachment to the Church from which they had cut themselves adrift. The experiences of his second tour, in 1664, were equally instructive. He went in the first instance to Amsterdam, where he employed himself partly in the study of Hebrew, but much more in cultivating friendships with the leading men of all the sects which congregated there—Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Socinians, Roman Catholics; there were none whose society he shunned or from whom he failed to learn some useful lesson[3]. He came to Amsterdam with a bias towards principles of toleration. He went away convinced, not merely that toleration was practically possible—though it was much to have realized what half his countrymen denied—but also that it might be of inestimable advantage to the

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 199.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 199. It is worth noting that Burnet made some friends at Court on this occasion, and took some pains to get an insight into current politics. Airy, i. 358. His friendship with Lauderdale was first formed in the year 1663 (see his letter to Lauderdale in the Bodleian, MSS. Rawl. C. 936, fo. 27).

[3] MS. Aut. fo. 200: "I settled at Amsterdam to the wonder of all who went to Holland for their studies. I had another design . . . to know the best men of all the several forms of religion."

religious life of a nation. He had seen that every sect was capable of producing loyal citizens and devoted Christians. He had also seen that the differences in their teaching were much slighter and of far less influence on conduct than he had been in the habit of supposing. The last vestige of an inclination to employ compulsion in the interests of unity faded from his mind; but he conceived the hope that the reunion of Protestantism through mutual compromise was much more than a possibility of the distant future. In this spirit, after a short stay in Paris among the Huguenots, he returned to Scotland at the end of 1664, and accepted the living of Saltoun. His presentation was announced to the Presbytery of Haddington on Nov. 10, 1664; early in 1665 he was ordained a priest [1].

On the details of his work at Saltoun it is unnecessary to dilate. He was an exemplary parish-priest, but parochial work failed to engross his superabundant energies. For three years he had been living in the company of ideals; the return to realities was a rude shock. He had hoped to see Episcopacy win its way in Scotland by sheer force of merit. He found that as a system it was further than ever from the affections of the people; and this through its own faults. Instead of preaching, there was persecution. The bishops, non-resident for the most part, devoted to political intrigue the time and energy which they should have given to their dioceses. The lower clergy, thus released from supervision, were sinking into an apathetic indolence which made them the byword of their presbyterian opponents. The situation was a grave one. If the Established Church were not reformed from within, the utmost good-will of the government would be insufficient to maintain it. Two years after he came to Saltoun, Burnet stepped into the breach and wrote a startling letter of remonstrance to the bishops [2]. "What is done," he wrote, "for

[1] See the extracts from the Proceedings of the Presbytery of Haddington in the *Bannatyne Miscellany* iii. 391 ff.

[2] Of this letter a copy exists in the Bodleian, MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 39. It is wrongly described in the catalogue, and has escaped notice hitherto, probably for this reason. The volume which includes it belonged to Burnet's son.

the promoting of religion? . . . Hath the King and Parliament restored you only for the name of Episcopacy? Do you think that any desire that form of Church government only for itself? Sure it will never be sought for only upon that ground alone, but as it may be a powerful mean of advancing the good designs of the Gospel. What moral virtue or Christian grace is raised to any greater height by your coming in? Are you spending yourselves for the real good of the Church?" From the general he passes to the particular. Point by point he reviews the conduct of the bishops and contrasts their practice with the theory of their office as defined by the canons of the early Church. After the bishops he attacks the clergy; then finally reflects upon the moral deterioration of the Scottish character, and asks once more whether the bishops can point to any single useful measure which they have taken for reforming these abuses. "Consider not the person but the advice," is his conclusion. "Remember that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God hath perfected praise." This was bold language for a youth of twenty-five, and it embroiled Burnet with almost the whole bench of bishops. They were angry at the plainness of the letter; their anger was increased when they learned that the author, while calling it "a private monitorie" not meant for publication, had allowed copies to circulate among his friends [1]. By this imprudence Burnet forfeited all claim to their indulgence, and we need not blame the bishops for inflicting on him a severe and public reprimand. As to the wisdom of the letter itself, opinions may be divided. But Leighton thought none the worse of Burnet for the incident. Neither did the Presbytery of Haddington; for they chose him as their clerk in the following year [2].

The strangest part of the story is yet to be told. Burnet, after his reprimand, had resolved to prove, by a life of seclusion and ascetic practices, that popularity had not been the motive for his action [3]. Asceticism, proving too great a strain upon his constitution, was soon abandoned; but

[1] Cockburn, p. 40. [2] *Bannatyne Miscellany* iii. 391.
[3] MS. Aut. fo. 201.

there seemed little danger that his desire for privacy would be resisted. Suddenly however Burnet found himself in the position of a Court favourite. Lauderdale had come to power, and Lauderdale felt little liking for the bishops. Religious convictions he had none; he had abjured the Covenant as easily as he had sworn to it, and he was prepared to be of any creed which circumstances made expedient. But there was a long standing rivalry between himself and Sharp the Primate. That Burnet had offended Sharp was enough to recommend him in the eyes of Lauderdale. Nor was this all. Lauderdale had decided that his master's interests and his own would best be served by a policy of religious conciliation. He understood his countrymen enough to know that on religious questions they could be neither bent nor broken. He imagined that if they had their own way in religion the Crown might govern Scotland as absolutely as it pleased. Leighton seemed the most suitable man to act as mediator, and Leighton was accordingly translated to the archbishopric of Glasgow. Burnet, whose acquaintance Lauderdale had formed as long ago as 1663, was singled out to serve as one of Leighton's lieutenants. In 1668 there were plans on foot for altering the constitution of the episcopate. The bishops were to be reduced to the position of moderators over Presbyterian synods, if the Presbyterians could be induced to conform upon these terms. Burnet took a part in the earliest negotiations. They carried him to Hamilton, where he earned the favour of the Duchess. The Duchess introduced him to the Rector of the University of Glasgow. He made a favourable impression, and in a little while he was amazed to learn that the Rector had procured his election to a Divinity Professorship. Leighton or Lauderdale, or both, had been at work in the interests of the obscure minister of Saltoun.

To Glasgow Burnet went in November, 1669[1]. It was his first introduction to an active life, and he was never more severely tasked than during the four years of his residence at Glasgow. Characteristically he made it his first care to remodel the scheme of theological lectures. He planned a course

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 204.

of which his friends remarked that it would be excellent, if it did not start from the assumption that one professor could do the work of three. Burnet, nothing daunted, put his plan into execution and worked it, without assistance, for the whole time of his stay in Glasgow [1]. He lectured five days in the week upon five several subjects; and on an average devoted six hours a day to preparation for his lecture. In term the rest of his time was spent partly in preaching, partly in hearing the complaints of Presbyterians and Episcopalians. He had the reputation of influence at Court; everyone in the west of Scotland who saw anything to hope or fear from the new schemes of comprehension came and besought his favour [2]. Such was his life for eight months in the year. In the vacations he went much to Hamilton; for his patroness had engaged him to write the Memoirs of her husband's family. And soon he was called upon to travel farther afield.

As the Memoirs touched upon the most equivocal part of Lauderdale's career, that nobleman was naturally anxious to see and to revise them before their publication. At his desire Burnet waited upon him at Whitehall in 1671, and received a most courteous welcome. Burnet, according to his own account, mistrusted his new patron from the first [3]; but this account was written in the light of subsequent events; and there is every reason to suppose that, in common with many men of greater penetration than himself, he fell a dupe to Lauderdale's unrivalled powers of hypocrisy. For the next two years they were upon the best of terms. Lauderdale revised the Memoirs at his pleasure. Burnet helped to reconcile him with the House of Hamilton, and was rewarded with a glimpse of Lauderdale's ulterior designs. These, in so far as they were secular, filled him with dismay. The idea of using Ireland against Scotland and Scotland against the English Opposition was no sooner revealed to him than he burst into emphatic protests [4]. But Lauderdale, with ready tact, diverted the conversation to the problem of the Scottish

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 204–6.
[2] Airy, i. 516.
[3] MS. Aut. fo. 206.
[4] Airy, ii. 26; *Parl. Hist.* iv. 685.

Church. Here the two were in complete agreement. Burnet explained at some length his own views, which were also those of Leighton. Lauderdale made them the basis of a measure of Indulgence, under which a number of benefices in the disaffected parts were to be divided between the conforming and the non-conforming ministers. This scheme, though a failure from the first and the pretext of much persecution in the end, was still the one good consequence of Burnet's new alliance [1]. He and Leighton did indeed enter, by Lauderdale's permission, upon an interminable course of conferences with the Presbyterians, but only to find that compromise was an impossibility. The Presbyterians would not allow so much as the name of bishop in their Church, neither would they extend to others that toleration which they claimed as a right for themselves. The failure of the negotiations of 1673 is freely confessed in a private memorial to the Privy Council, written by Burnet and endorsed by the Archbishop [2]. That episcopacy cannot be kept up in the disaffected western districts is the conclusion which they are reluctantly driven to express.

So far there was failure, but no cause for shame. Unfortunately Burnet's sanguine disposition made him in some smaller matters the dupe and tool of his new patron. At Lauderdale's suggestion he wrote two compositions of which the most lenient critic can only say that they did no harm to any human being but the author.

The first of these was a short paper on Polygamy, not meant for publication. One day in London, Lauderdale came with a long face to Burnet and disclosed the secret of the Duke of York's conversion. The Protestant succession was in peril, and could only be saved by the arrangement of a second and more fruitful marriage for the King. To divorce Queen Catherine was useless: a full and complete divorce

[1] Airy, i. 535. The Indulgence is given verbatim in Woodrow, ii. 130. Cf. Grub, iii. 230.

[2] 11th Rep. Hist. MSS. Com., Part vi, p. 148. That Burnet really played an important part in these negotiations and was considered as a man of mark in the Scottish Church may be inferred from the fact that his name was down for promotion to a bishopric. *Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Soc.) ii. 219.

(*a vinculo matrimonii*) could, as the law then stood, only follow upon the proof of a pre-existing impediment to the marriage; and such a proof was in this case impossible. But surely in a case where the national religion was at stake, the example of the patriarchs and Solomon might be admitted as a precedent. Burnet, like Martin Luther on a similar occasion, listened, hesitated, was convinced. At Lauderdale's persuasion he wrote a paper on the subject for the private reading of the King. Polygamy, he argued, is expressly recognized by the Old Testament and nowhere forbidden by the New. "It is to be considered that if our Lord's design had been to antiquate polygamy, it being so deeply rooted in the men of that age, confirmed by so much famous and unquestioned precedent, and rivetted by so long a practice, He must have done it plainly and authoritatively"[1]. Cogent as this reasoning might seem to a mere politician, it did not satisfy the conscience of the author. A few months later he wrote to Lauderdale explaining that upon reflection he desired to retract his paper. The matrimonial project dropped. Charles remained as faithful to monogamy as law could make him. But Burnet did not get his paper back. It was subsequently used against him by his former friend and proved a godsend to the Tory pamphleteers.

His second escapade, although less obviously reprehensible, was to be the source of hardly less embarrassment in the future. In 1674 he published four dialogues entitled *A Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland.* According to his enemies the *Vindication* is a plea for the theory of non-resistance in its grossest form. This accusation is not altogether just. It would have been no wonder if a young and eager theologian, whose party was entirely dependent on the favour of the Crown, had swallowed a theory which was good enough for the author of the *Ductor Dubitantium*[2].

[1] The paper is printed by Higgons, p. 160. The circumstances under which it was written are narrated by Burnet in *Reflections upon Dr. Hickes' Discourses* p. 76.

[2] See Jeremy Taylor, *Works* xiii. 463 (ed. Heber), where he defends the doctrine of non-resistance with arguments borrowed from Hobbes. The *Ductor Dubitantium* was published in 1660.

But from this pitfall Burnet's legal studies saved him. He followed Grotius in admitting cases when resistance may be lawful to the subject: as when the sovereign deserts his kingdom, calls in the aid of foreign soldiers to oppress his subjects, or totally subverts the constitution. But in his anxiety to convict the Presbyterians of unchristian conduct Burnet caught at special arguments which made his general reservations meaningless. He asserted that in the Scottish constitution the King enjoyed an arbitrary and untrammelled power. Short of asking his subjects to abandon a religious creed which they conscientiously professed, there was no command, he said, which the King of Scotland might not issue and which his subjects were not bound, as Christians, to obey. The proofs which he adduced would have applied with equal force to the case of England or of any other nation in Europe. No doubt he said more than he intended. No doubt he had good reason for being irritated with the "furious temper of the Scots Presbyterians and their continual acts of violence to the episcopal clergy"[1]. The fact remains that, in 1688 he found it necessary to refute himself, to admit that Scotland had a constitution, and to vindicate the sacred right of revolution before a Presbyterian audience[2].

These vagaries had at least one good effect. They gave him an independent footing in the inner circles of Whitehall; and this was enough to shatter his illusions on the subject of the royal policy in Scotland. There is a touch of comedy in his early interviews with the King and the Duke of York. Never were conversations conducted more completely at cross-purposes. The royal brothers had grown a little tired of Lauderdale, a little disposed to court the Duke of Hamilton. Burnet would certainly help them in this object; and they hoped that so eloquent an advocate of toleration might be useful for other schemes of a less innocuous character. Accordingly he was allowed to lecture Charles and James

[1] 1st Rep. Hist. MSS. Com., p. 113 (Letter from Burnet to the Duke of Hamilton).

[2] Vide "Six Papers containing reasons against the repealing of the Acts of Parliament," &c. p. 14.

upon their mistresses, upon the art of government, and even upon the proofs of the Protestant religion[1]. Some time elapsed before he realized the motive of this unusual condescension. Buckingham, who was not without good-nature, undeceived him. "He told me that he knew courts better than I did. . . . I would feel the ill-effects of the favour I then had if I did not strike into some compliance; and since I was resolved against these he advised me to withdraw from court the sooner the better"[2]. The prediction was soon justified. In 1674 Burnet began to feel himself no longer welcome at the Court. His lectures were brought to an end. His name was struck off the list of royal chaplains. Finally he was forbidden the levée, and recommended not to return to Scotland, lest he might find himself in a prison from which escape would not be easy.

That Burnet should fall out of favour when his honesty had been found impervious to persuasion need not surprise us in the least. His arbitrary banishment from Scotland is less simple to explain. Lauderdale was the cause of this severity. He had quarrelled with his protégé at the end of 1673, and since then had been deaf to the most humble supplications for renewal of his favour[3]. Burnet's own version of the quarrel is that the favour shown him by the King aroused the jealousy of Lauderdale[4], but this is neither a probable nor a sufficient explanation. Burnet was not quite so important as he fancied: and, even if we admitted his suggestion as correct, we should still be at a loss to know why he was persecuted after his disgrace. The fact was that he would have been an awkward man to leave at large in Scotland at this moment. He would certainly be courted by Lauderdale's opponents, and could, if he chose, reveal to them some highly compromising secrets. Charles had done more than hint to him a preference for the Roman Church. Lauderdale had

[1] Airy, ii. 27, 29. [2] Airy, ii. 34.

[3] Burnet is found on Dec. 10, 1673, writing from Glasgow a deprecatory letter to Lauderdale (Rawl. MSS. C. 936, fo. 27). Apparently he had been accused of intriguing in Scotland and at Whitehall in the Hamilton interest. This, at all events, is the charge from which he clears himself in the letter.

[4] Airy, ii. 37.

been still more incautious. "He asked me, if the King should need an army from Scotland to tame those of England whether that might be relied upon. I told him certainly not. . . . He said he was of another mind; the hope of the spoil of England would fetch them on"[1]. Such was the substance of a private conversation which the two had held as far back as 1673. It was still fresh in Burnet's memory: doubtless in Lauderdale's as well[2].

Thus at the beginning of 1675 Burnet's connexion with the party of prerogative was ended. He submitted perforce to the illegal sentence of exile, resigned his professorship at Glasgow, and settled in London to meditate upon his wrongs. Half-hearted persecution rarely fails to recoil upon the persecutor: and so it was in this case. Burnet was not deterred from publishing his wrongs: and his complaint reaching the ears of the English Opposition he was immediately summoned to give evidence against Lauderdale, first before a committee, afterwards at the bar of the House of Commons. After some demurs he repeated all that he had learned of the new scheme of Thorough[3]. His revelations had not so much effect as they were designed to produce. The Commons did not venture to impeach the favourite, and Charles refused to entertain repeated requests for his dismissal. Still it was no fault of Burnet if his sometime patron had not shared the fate of Strafford, and afterwards he felt some pangs of conscience. In fact the schemes of Lauderdale, though treasonable, were so chimerical that they might safely have been left a secret. And if they were treasonable in 1675, they had been equally treasonable eighteen months before, when they were first divulged to Burnet. Burnet's denunciation should have been made much earlier, or never made at all. The best excuse

[1] Airy, ii. 26.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 205: "The truth was, the Duke of Lauderdale had put himself so much in my power by speaking so truly to me that I had reason to believe he would shut me up and keep me close."

[3] *Parl. Hist.* iv. 685; Grey's *Debates* iii. 18, 30; Airy, ii. 73. An independent report, in the hand of Sir John Malet, a member of this Parliament, is to be found in B. M. MSS. Add. 32094, fo. 357. The army from Scotland was, according to this version, to enforce the Declaration of Indulgence in England.

which we can offer for him is that which he makes in the *History of his Own Times*: "I had been for above a year in a perpetual agitation, and was not calm enough nor cool enough to reflect on my conduct as I ought to have done. I had lost much of a spirit of devotion, and so it was no wonder if I committed grave errors"[1].

With this crowning indiscretion began a new and brighter phase of Burnet's political career; henceforth there is much to be admired, and little which calls for extenuation in his conduct. Thanks to the friendship of Sir Harbottle Grimston he became the Preacher at the Rolls Chapel, and settled down in London to live a quiet life. But circumstances were too strong for him. In the last ten years of Charles the Second there was no political question but one. The privileges of the English Church were threatened; and whatever might be the secret ends of professional politicians, there were in the nation only two parties, one of which attacked while the other defended the Church's monopoly of office and honours in the State. On that monopoly, many thought, her existence as an Establishment and even as a Church depended. This, with one important reservation, was the view which Burnet took. He was prepared to give the Protestant Dissenter the right to hold the most responsible positions. To make the same concession to Roman Catholics would have seemed to him an act of madness. History and his own experience had convinced him that the religious opinions of most men are moulded, whether they realize the fact or not, by fashion and convenience. If the time should ever come when the avenue to eminence and royal favour should lie through the portals of the Roman Church, he foreboded that, as in Mary's reign, the indifferent majority would change their creed without much hesitation. One asks if, on this supposition, it was worth while to save men from themselves: if, when no creed commanded more than a lip homage, it mattered what the prevailing creed might be. But Burnet has an answer ready. Conventional religion may be worthless in itself: at the worst it is

[1] Airy, l. c. That Lauderdale's scheme was not a figment of Burnet's brain may be seen from a passage in the *Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Soc.) ii. 140.

invaluable as the source of that conventional morality which is at once the only safeguard of the social order and the only foundation upon which the teacher of a more spiritual morality can build. The moral standards of a people depend upon the nature of the prevalent religion. If it could be proved—and Burnet thought it could—that the Protestant communions were, in respect of moral teaching, superior to the Church from which they had revolted, then it was lawful and imperative to intrigue, or even to bear arms, in the cause of a Protestant Establishment; the more so because history showed that Romanism, with the weight of numbers on its side, would never tolerate the teaching of a rival creed. For Protestantism there was no middle course between political ascendency on the one hand and absolute extinction on the other. It might be asked if this had been the teaching of the early Christians, or if it was not the case that the Church had triumphed in the fight with pagan cults because it had been purified by persecution. "Our case is different," answers Burnet. "It is one thing to resist a persecuting sovereign, and another to prevent the would-be persecutor from usurping power to which he has no legal claim. It is not unjust to disarm an actual or potential persecutor. As for the argument that persecution could not crush our Church, there is a sad confession to be made. The early Christians triumphed over force not merely because their creed was superior in quality to paganism, but also because they had a zeal which persecution could not quench. Their creed we have inherited, but indifference and infidelity have damped our zeal until we are no better than a smoking flax. This must be amended, or the Reformed communion will die a natural death. The clergy must be roused to a greater interest in their pastoral duties; the laity accustomed to a sterner discipline. But for any such revival time is needed. For the present we must utilize whatever adventitious strength the Reformation settlement and the Tests have given us, that so we may secure a time of grace in which to set our house in order"[1]. This, or something

[1] See, for example, the *Reasons against Repealing the Test Acts* (1687) and *Some Reflections on his Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience* (1687).

like this, was the train of reasoning which now impelled Burnet to snatch at every opportunity of pronouncing, in the pulpit and through the printing press, upon the questions of the hour. If we took his writings of this period by themselves we should only see a part of his intention. The time had not yet come when he could obtain a hearing for detailed schemes of toleration, comprehension, and revival. But even now his passing utterances [1] show that he is far from thinking of the privileges of the English Church as the ultimate object of his policy. They were with him a means towards the revivification of the dry bones of reformed religion.

His purpose brought him into contact with all kinds of men and coteries. He corresponded constantly with Halifax [2]; he kept in touch with Shaftesbury and Sidney so long as any incidental good might be expected from policies of which in their main principles he strongly disapproved. Accident gave him for a neighbour Sir Thomas Littleton, a leading member of the parliamentary opposition. It rarely happened that the two friends did not spend some hours of the day in keen political discussion, and Burnet's arguments were frequently retailed at second-hand to an attentive House of Commons [3]. With Essex and with Russell he was on terms of the closest friendship. At the same time on all indifferent matters he studiously avoided giving umbrage to the Court [4]. In this there was no time-serving. In 1680 he wrote to Charles II a letter of warning and advice couched in the plainest and severest

[1] About 1680 he writes to a friend, "I have been told that my preaching of gentleness to such as differ from us in opinions . . . has been considered as favouring Nonconformists, and a message was sent to me to do so no more, but as long as I have a mouth to preach the Gospel I will never be silent in that which I look on as one of the main duties of it" (Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 2). See also his *Sermon preached in the Rolls Chapel on Nov.* 5, 1684.

[2] See the first volume of Miss Foxcroft's *Life of Halifax*, passim.

[3] MS. Aut. fo. 205.

[4] In a letter written circ. 1679 Burnet says, "I continue as I did living very much at home. I have refused several offers [i. e. of livings] made me in London. . . . Since the King is against my being in the City I feel obliged on such a personal concern to give his Majesty no offence" (Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 2).

terms[1]. He refused several tempting offers by which the King essayed to win him over from his Whig connexions; and while it was impossible to tax him with disloyal acts, his general attitude was such that Charles could never hear his name without expressions of impatience and disgust. Still he made it plain that he was no demagogue, no republican, no favourer of Monmouth. Let the Court but give sufficient guarantees for the maintenance of the Establishment and even a Roman Catholic sovereign would find him a devoted subject. He was one of the few members of the Opposition who refused to feign belief in the tales of Titus Oates[2]. The most generally accepted suggestion for a compromise on the Exclusion Bill emanated from his circle[3].

When all allowances are made for possible exaggerations in his narrative of these occurrences it is still surprising how far his influence reached, even among men who had no sympathy with his ideals. His enemies explained the fact in their own way. They represented him as the main link in a chain of treasonable correspondence, which was supposed to reach from Westminster through all the disaffected parts of Scotland[4]. It may indeed be true that Burnet influenced opinion in his native country as in England. But he did not owe his power in either kingdom to any compact following. He was the man of ideas who found the raw material for speeches and for manifestoes. He was the orator and pamphleteer whose words could make or mar the fortunes of a movement. No human being would now read his pamphlets, at least for their own sake. His sermons, though more tolerable, do not altogether justify his reputation as a pulpit orator. Delivered without notes and to a mixed audience, they are mechanically arranged and studiously pedestrian in their style. Long arguments, imaginative flights, and all rhetorical embellishments he avoided upon principle[5]. This was the style then in

[1] Airy, ii. 299; *History of His Own Times* vi. 271. The rough draft of this letter, with a memorandum as to the mode of delivering it to the King, is in the Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 3. It is dated Jan. 29, 16$\frac{7}{8}\frac{9}{0}$.

[2] Airy, ii. 156.

[3] Airy, ii. 211, 218.

[4] 13th Rep. Hist. MSS. Com. ii. 39, 49.

[5] See his advice to preachers in the *Pastoral Care* c. 9.

vogue, and Burnet is not the best example of the style. He failed in his efforts to attain the correctness and simplicity of Tillotson and Sprat. Still it is easy to believe that he produced a great impression. The high sincerity of his tone, his seeming want of art, the sonorous torrent of his words assured him the attention of his congregation. Onslow, by no means an indiscriminate admirer, has recorded that the only public sermon which he heard from Burnet moved him and everybody in the audience to an extraordinary degree [1]. Political feeling, too, told in his favour. Men came to the Rolls Chapel with their minds on fire. The preacher was certain of their sympathy before he said a word. His business was merely to confirm the opinions which they held already. But Burnet was not the only preacher of the day who enjoyed this great advantage. He had competitors of no mean order, and he surpassed them all in popularity.

It was in the heat and tumult of this period that Burnet planned his greatest controversial work, the *History of the Reformation.* The first volume appeared in 1679, the next in 1681. The third was not published till 1715, but it consists entirely of matter supplementary to the other two; the *History,* whether regarded as polemic or as literature, was complete when the second volume had been published. In controversy and in historical science it marks the beginning of a new epoch. It was the first attempt to write a judicial account of the English Reformation from authentic sources. The point of view is frankly Protestant; but Burnet has sufficient breadth of mind and sufficient confidence in his own case to be above the vulgar artifices of concealment and misrepresentation. He approaches his subject in a philosophic spirit. The Reformation was to his mind a work of providence accomplished through human and imperfect agents. There were deadly errors to be rooted out and priceless truths to be recovered from oblivion. But the errors were only recognized by slow degrees; the truth was long in dawning on the minds of Protestants. Hence the fluctuations of opinion which delayed the progress of reform. Hence too the disagreements

[1] In a note on the *History of His Own Times* (Airy, ii. 442).

of reformed communions on matters of speculation: there must be differences when finite intellects are independently engaged in the exploration of the infinite. But on essentials all the Reformers were agreed: and this is sufficient to confirm our faith in human reason. There is a spiritual unity among the Protestants which has more value because it is more spontaneous and sincere than the formal unity of Rome. Results, then, justify the Reformation. We need not shrink from owning that its course was marked by crimes and influenced by personal ambitions. The work of Protestantism can neither be proved by vindicating nor refuted by aspersing the characters of those who smoothed the way for it. The highest ends of Providence are always brought about through natural causes, often by the hands of most unworthy agents. Good is educed from evil, and many selfish wills are yoked together to fulfil a purpose of which they are at best but half-conscious[1].

Burnet in fact is the exponent of a new historical method. He is less concerned with persons than with the genesis of new ideas in the turmoil of events. His vindication of reformed religion rests upon a contrast between the system into which the earliest reformers were born, and that which was established as the consequence of their revolt. His interest in the visible causes by which the transition was affected is almost purely scientific. He feels a sympathetic admiration for Cranmer and his fellow workers; but to praise or blame them lies outside the main scope of his work. And whatever criticism might be made upon the details of his work, its central conception was one which his opponents showed great prudence in ignoring. Even Bossuet, the most able of them all, was confounded by this new idea of historical development which blunted all the usual weapons of polemic. He made a passing effort to discredit it, but soon fell back upon the old and now irrelevant arguments of his party. His great attack upon the *History of the Reformation* is

[1] See the preface to vol. i of the *History of the Reformation*; the *Letter to M. Auzout* printed in Pocock's edition, i. 575; the *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation* 60.

ingenious and eloquent, but beside the mark[1]. In fact no Roman controversialist, before the nineteenth century, was able to assimilate the new idea and turn it against the Protestant position.

Thus Burnet's *History* raised the controversy which it handled to a higher plane of thought. To meet him fairly the future apologists of Rome would find it necessary to prove that the medieval system, in spite of all abuses, enshrined a more profound philosophy than that of any Protestant confession. But in details the execution of his work leaves much to be desired[2]. His researches were by no means thorough. He merely skimmed the cream of the materials which lay ready to his hand. Whole pages of his narrative depend upon no better source than Thuanus, Foxe, and Sleidan. It is no uncommon thing to find him misreading or misunderstanding his authorities. His transcripts are inaccurate, his dates more often wrong than right. The printers were the cause of many minor blunders which he did not take the trouble to correct in proof. Scholars like Wharton, who read Burnet for the pleasure of picking holes in him, found matter for malicious exultation in every second page. The *errata* and *addenda* form a third of the whole work. Any historian of the Reformation is bound to start from Burnet, but it would be rash to quote him as an authority on any point of detail. And yet in spite of all these errors Burnet's general impressions of persons and events are usually sound and always worth consideration. He had a measure of the true historian's insight, and though he was less than just to the system of which he described the downfall, he was in perfect sympathy with the Reformers; he defended the Reformation as they would have wished it to be defended. He expressed in fact the latent thought which Protestantism had long been struggling to enunciate. For this reason his book will last as long as Protestantism. It may be corrected, and other writers may supply that side of the story which it leaves untold; superseded it cannot be. For more than

[1] See Bossuet, *Histoire des Variations des Églises Protestantes*, bk. vii.

[2] See the remarks of Mr Pocock in vol. vii of his edition.

a century the popular conception of the Reformation was mainly derived from Burnet's narrative, and another century of hostile criticism has failed to eradicate the impression which it made.

The reception of the book was enough to turn a stronger head than Burnet's. He was thanked in formal resolution by both Houses of Parliament. The *History* was at once translated into the leading languages of Europe. It was quoted by all Protestants, vituperated by all Catholics; no one who wrote or spoke about religion could ignore it. When he went to Paris in 1683 he found himself the cynosure of every eye. Scholars competed for the honour of an interview; he became the fashion in polite society. Louis XIV, anxious at the moment to humiliate the Court of Rome, considered that he could not do so more effectually than by patronizing the great Protestant historian. The English ambassador was astonished and annoyed to hear that royal coaches had been placed at Burnet's orders, and to see him in the place of honour at the royal levée. He could not understand how a mere man of letters came to be thus favoured, and suspected that Burnet was there as the accredited envoy of the English Opposition [1].

Burnet remained in England for four years after the publication of the second volume of the *History*. But events were coming to a pass when the pen could not control them, and parties were sundering beyond the possibility of mediation. The Exclusion Bill had failed; a Roman Catholic stood next in the order of succession, and nothing had been done to fortify the Establishment against the evil days in store. The party of the Whigs seemed broken. Shaftesbury had been hounded into exile. Essex died by his own hand. Russell and Sidney were butchered in the forms of law. Burnet had never sympathized with the more desperate projects of the Whigs. He still held with Grotius that nothing short of a total subversion of the constitution could justify resistance to the sovereign, and arbitrary power had not reached this point as yet. But with a constancy which cannot be too much

[1] See Lord Preston's letters from Paris in the 7th Rep. Hist. MSS. Com., pp. 292, 343, &c.

admired he was true to the friends whose principles he disapproved. He stood by Russell at his trial, attended him in the last hours before his execution, assisted in the composition of his dying vindication, and undertook to present it to the King [1]. Charles with his usual cynicism said that all was done for notoriety, and that Burnet would cheerfully be hanged for the privilege of making an oration from the ladder [2]. But the sarcasm is one which reflects more discredit upon its author than its object.

The death of Charles, the unmistakable signs by which the new King signified his future policy, and the fear of being involuntarily implicated in Monmouth's futile rising, decided Burnet to quit England for a time. One of the last acts of the late King had been to drive him from the Rolls Chapel. He could no longer preach in London; his old political associates were gone; there was nothing to be gained by exposing himself to further risks. He made one last attempt in the character of a mediator. He begged the favour of an interview with James in the hope that he might open the King's eyes to the folly and futility of a quarrel with the Church. But James refused to see him; and in May, 1685, with the gloomiest expectations for the future, Burnet turned his back on England [3].

His first anxiety was to avoid the haunts of English refugees. No place of residence was less likely than Paris to be objectionable in the eyes of the English Court; and, remembering his reception in 1683, he returned to the French capital with pleasure. But times were changed since his first visit. Louis XIV was now on the point of revoking the Edict of Nantes; to coquet with Protestantism was no longer his policy; nor had he any further interest in alarming the English Court by a show of favour to the Whigs. Burnet received

[1] Airy, ii. 379. Burnet was accused of having suggested the arguments embodied in this Vindication. According to his own account he merely made suggestions as to the arrangement. Lady Russell wrote to Charles exculpating Burnet from the charge of having written the Vindication. See Lord John Russell's *Life of Russell* p. 238.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 207.

[3] *History of his Own Times* iii. 15, 22; the date in MS. Aut. fo. 209.

a warning from Barillon, the ambassador, that James intended to demand his extradition on a charge of complicity in Monmouth's rebellion, and that the request would probably be granted. In August, therefore, he left Paris on a course of travel which took him through Italy, Switzerland, and the Rhine provinces. His wanderings are described in a series of letters to Robert Boyle which were afterwards published as a book. But the two most interesting adventures which befell him are not described in this correspondence. They illustrate very widely the European reputation which he then enjoyed. At Rome, whither he had only ventured after hesitation, he was surprised to find himself received with some distinction. He might have had a private interview with Innocent XI for the asking. This honour he declined, but he made no scruples about engaging in political discussion with the Cardinals Howard and d'Estrées. They assured him that the headstrong policy of James II was nowhere more disliked than at Rome; that the Papacy was far more anxious for the humiliation of the most Christian King of France than for the conversion of the English heretics; that all true sons of the Church were grieved to see James making himself a pensioner, when he might have been the counterpoise of Louis XIV. In short, it was quite absurd that at this moment, of all others, Protestants should apprehend a general Catholic conspiracy against the Reformed communions. Burnet bethought him of the persecuted Huguenots and was not convinced. But it is remarkable that the Cardinals should have found it worth their while to argue with him [1]. At Geneva his reception was still more flattering. He found the Genevan ministers at issue on a most important question. They had a confession which all candidates for the ministry were compelled to sign. But some of the younger ministers were agitating for a change. They thought that the *consensus* was too positive on some indifferent questions and desired that for the future nothing more should be exacted than a promise not to preach against its doctrines. Burnet was consulted and took the side of the

[1] *History of his Own Times* iii. 84.

more liberal party. He records with satisfaction that his view prevailed [1].

In the summer of 1686 he came at length to Holland. He avoided the haunts of Scotch and English exiles and began to look about him for some secluded spot within easy reach of England, whence he could watch the fortunes of the Church and help her with his pen as opportunity suggested. But his light could not remain hid. William and Mary, at the instance of their English correspondents, pressed him to pay them a visit at the Hague [2]. He came, and was delighted beyond measure with the character of the Princess. "She has," he wrote, "a modesty, a sweetness and a humility in her that cannot be enough admired. She has a vast understanding and knows a great deal. In short she has all that one can wish for to make her one of the greatest blessings that has been in human nature" [3]. Of William's character he was more doubtful. The Prince's cold dry manner was not calculated to inspire enthusiasm, and it might reasonably be doubted whether his religious creed and the autocratic principles in which he had been reared had not unfitted him to be the husband of an English Queen. "I had a mind to see a little into the prince's notions, before I should engage myself deeper in his services." But in the course of several lengthy conversations Burnet convinced himself that William was prepared to respect the privileges of the English Church. He became the Prince's fast ally, acted as his secretary for English affairs, and undertook to instruct the Princess in the history of her future kingdom and the intricacies of English party politics [4]. William was inclined to underrate him; but shortly after his arrival he rendered to the Prince a service which, though it was never rewarded with a word of thanks, forced William to acknowledge that Burnet had his uses. He persuaded Mary to assure her husband that in the event of her accession to the English throne she would in all things be governed by his

[1] *History of his Own Times* iii. 127–9. The episode is interesting as an anticipation of his policy with regard to the Thirty-nine Articles.

[2] Ibid. iii. 131.

[3] From a letter in Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 1.

[4] *History of his Own Times* iii. 134.

wishes. William owned, in private conference with his friends, that Burnet had settled in an hour's conversation a matter on which he had tormented himself for the nine years of his married life. To persuade Mary was not difficult, but no one before Burnet came had courage to attempt the task. He may fairly claim to have prevented a misunderstanding which, if allowed to grow, might have changed the course of history and done incalculable damage to the cause of civil liberty [1].

In 1686 there was, so far as Burnet knew, no intention at the Hague of coercing James by force of arms. In his private correspondence he earnestly disclaimed all connexion with conspirators. "I do assure you," he writes, "that I am so entirely possessed with the doctrine of the Cross that I am further than ever from all things that lead to the drawing the sword against those in whose hands God hath put it" [2]. He dissuaded his patrons from protesting against the Court of High Commission and the expulsion of the Fellows of Magdalen. At his instance the Prince and Princess returned a conciliatory reply to James' request that they would support the Declaration of Indulgence, and, while refusing to give up the tests, declared that they would use their influence with Parliament to procure a statute granting the fullest liberty of worship [3]. Burnet's influence in England was at the service of the Prince; but it was used as yet for no more serious end than that of organizing a moderate and constitutional opposition. This however was enough to draw upon his head the implacable hostility of James II. Burnet's dismissal from the Court of the Hague was imperiously demanded: the Prince and Princess complied so far that they promised to hold no personal intercourse with him [4]. Still the King was dissatisfied. Proceedings on a charge of treason were instituted against Burnet in the Scottish courts, and his extra-

[1] *History of his Own Times* iii. 137. [2] Bodleian MSS. Add. D. 23, No. 1.

[3] *History of his Own Times* iii. 137, 160.

[4] Ibid. iii. 173. The promise was kept. Burnet had no further interviews with the Prince or Princess till the invasion of England. He communicated with them, however, through their ministers.

dition was demanded from the States. Upon their refusal to surrender him—he had just been naturalized as a Dutch citizen—a price of £3,000 was set upon his head, and Louis did not scruple to promise an asylum in his dominions to any one who would be good enough to murder Burnet. The danger seemed so real, that Burnet's house at the Hague was guarded by Dutch soldiers [1].

These menaces did not in the least deter him from serving William's interests, but they may have contributed to his acquiescence in methods more summary than had yet been tried. As to the precise date when he came round to this opinion he gives two different accounts. In one of his pamphlets he speaks as though it were the second Declaration of Indulgence which decided him [2]. But from the *History of his Own Times* it is clear that projects of invasion had received his sanction some months before that date [3].

The part which he played in the invasion does not call for detailed notice. William's manifestoes were framed in the first instance by his Dutch advisers, but upon Burnet fell the task of editing them for English circulation [4]. He was the most important of the pamphleteers by whom the sympathies of England and of Scotland were roused in William's favour. It has been stated, though it is improbable, that he managed the negotiations through which the Pope was persuaded to promise a benevolent neutrality towards William's expedition. It appears that he was employed to conciliate the Court of Hanover by promising that if William should succeed in conquering England, the rights of the Electress in the succession should be respected. Burnet assures us that he wrote to the Electress on his own responsibility, without consulting William; from which we may infer that the Prince or his advisers knew the art of suggesting without appearing to suggest [5]. In any case the services of Burnet were

[1] *History of his Own Times* iii. 212; Macaulay, i. 447 (Pop. Ed.); *Diary of Narcissus Luttrell* i. 434; MS. Aut. fo. 210.

[2] *Reflections upon a Pamphlet* (published 1696) pp. 35–6.

[3] *History of his Own Times* iii. 241.

[4] Ibid. iii. 173, 204, 300.

[5] Ibid. iii. 266.

considerable. Throughout the expedition he was constantly at William's side, and universally regarded as a counsellor of the first importance[1]. He was even strong enough to take an independent line on certain questions. He ventured to remonstrate with the Prince on the coldness of his bearing towards his English friends[2]. His influence was used to crush a project for vesting the Crown in William to the exclusion of his wife.

But his chief service was that of framing the religious policy to be adopted by the new King and Queen[3]. The settlement which he desired was that most acceptable to the great mass of moderate Churchmen, and in spite of obvious shortcomings may be commended as the most liberal which the nation was then prepared to accept. It had seemed likely at one period that William would adopt the far more advanced ideas of Monmouth, which were represented at his Court by Robert Ferguson. But the policy of Ferguson, however excellent in itself, would inevitably have alienated two-thirds of the Church from the cause of the Revolution; and there is therefore little reason to regret that in the tussle for ascendency Burnet maintained the upper hand. Unfortunately the cause which he represented was not completely won when the royal ear had been gained. The last word lay not with the King and Queen but with Parliament and Convocation. Upon Burnet devolved the duty of defending the royal policy in the House of Lords, which he entered as Bishop of Salisbury in 1689. In this he was but partially successful.

The first question of importance was that of the Nonjurors. Sympathizing with their scruples, Burnet exhausted all his ingenuity to save them from their too-exacting consciences. In a Pastoral Letter (1688) to the clergy of his diocese he did what he could to justify the Revolution on high Tory prin-

[1] 11th Rep. Hist. MSS. Com. v. 193; 14th Rep. ix. 452.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 211: "This offended him so that for some months after I was not admitted to speak to him."

[3] *History of his Own Times* iii. 136, 301. B. M. MSS. Add. 32681, fo. 313. (A memorandum written for William III showing which of the London clergy deserve preferment.)

ciples[1]. Obedience to the king *de facto* is the obvious duty of a Christian. Why then be troubled about the origin of William's title? And yet his title can be amply vindicated. He had commenced the war with James in a just cause; and "the success of a just war gives a lawful title to that which is acquired in the progress of it." The Pastoral Letter failed to convince the Nonjurors, and Parliament disclaimed responsibility for its theories in the most emphatic manner, ordering that it should be burnt by the common hangman in the Palace Yard at Westminster. Nothing daunted, Burnet tried another plan. The Nonjurors will not take the oaths, he said. But why should they be asked to do so? Bind them not to preach against the Government; administer the oaths where there is reasonable ground for suspecting treasonable designs; and, for the rest, believe that men who will not stoop to perjury are never likely to be found conspiring. These words of wisdom were thrown away on Parliament[2]. The Nonjuring schism came, and Burnet had to be contented with mitigating to the best of his ability the lot of the Nonjurors in his diocese.

In regard to toleration he was more successful. The Act of Toleration in all essentials represents his views upon the subject of religious freedom. Even the exceptions and reservations of the Act are vindicated by many passages in his writings. He would put pressure upon no man's conscience. But there were sects and creeds which he desired to isolate as carefully as an infectious disease. He denied the right of public worship and discussion to Roman Catholics, on the ground that their religion embodies principles which are destructive of all social order; to atheists, because to doubt the existence of a God argues a corrupt or stunted moral nature; the proofs of natural religion were, he thought, so strong that only the worst motives could induce men to deny them credence[3]. He was at his weakest in dealing with those

[1] Von Ranke speaks as though the letter literally represented Burnet's own views. But it seems evident that Burnet is purposely limiting himself to Tory arguments.

[2] *History of his Own Times* iv. 14.

[3] *Exposition of the Articles* p. 20 (ed. Page); *A Rational Method for proving the Truth of the Christian Religion*, &c.

sects which, like the Unitarians, denied some fundamental doctrine of revealed religion. These fundamental doctrines he held to be self-evident as much as the existence of a God; and he placed the Unitarians, despite his early experience in Amsterdam, on a scarcely higher moral level than the atheist. By "self-evident" he meant "historically proved," and never seems to have suspected that these terms are not identical; that no historical facts can be self-evident, or even demonstrated in the sense in which Euclid's theorems are demonstrated. He based his theology upon history, without recognizing that the logical corollary from his position was toleration of the largest kind[1].

He shows to more advantage in the debates upon the proposals for a Comprehension. Under this head two separate questions were comprised. The first related to the possibility of altering the Church's ritual and liturgy in such a way as would remove the objections of the Dissenters to participating in her public services; the second to the compulsory subscription of the Articles by the clergy. As to the first, Burnet held views the reverse of what are commonly described as Anglo-Catholic. He disliked all ornate ritual and vestments in themselves; he disliked them all the more as relics of the Middle Ages, badges of an ancient servitude, and incongruous with the spirit of Protestantism. He would cheerfully have simplified the public services, provided only that the right of authority to impose some general rule in the interests of decency and order should be allowed[2]. Concessions there must be; but they ought not to be all upon one side. Let the Church remember that it was her duty not to give offence to tender consciences. Let the Dissenters, on the other hand, consider whether their opposition to the usage of the Church was invariably conscientious, or whether it did not arise in many cases from self-will and objection to authority in general. They had no right to think of their submission to the national Church as a favour. The maintenance of unity, so far as this could be effected without a sacri-

[1] See the *Rational Method* and *Exposition of the Articles* Art. vi.

[2] *History of his Own Times* vi. 187 (part of the Conclusion).

fice of principle, was a duty incumbent on all Christians[1]. Why this should be so he does not trouble to explain. He thought of the Church from the politician's point of view; and it may be fairly said that, in common with most politicians, he ran the risk of forgetting the ideal significance of the institutions which he manipulated. One may read his various discussions of the Comprehension question from end to end without coming across any argument in favour of unity except that it is scriptural and prevents discord.

The Articles he made the subject of a separate treatise. The exegetical portion of this work was largely taken from the professorial lectures which he had delivered at Glasgow[2]. But his reflections on the use of the Articles, their authority, and the advisability of retaining them, have reference to questions of the time when his book was written. The substance of these reflections is as follows: They are in error who hold that under the existing law the Articles are no more than terms of peace. The subscriber to them does not merely bind himself to refrain from questioning their conclusion in a public manner; he is bound to profess a conscientious belief in them. Burnet professes that, for his own part, he believes in all the Articles. But he thinks that some of them may be legitimately called in question, as dealing with beliefs not fundamental in their character. The essential truths of Christianity, those which Scripture proves in a manner intelligible to the densest mind, are few and simple; whoever believes in these ought to be eligible for the ministry of a Christian Church. Long trains of deductive argument and metaphysical speculation are not to be forbidden, and may lead to truth; but truths which can only be proved in this way cannot be necessary to salvation. As a confession of faith the Anglican Articles were, he thought, superior to those of other Protestant communions by reason of their comparative simplicity; and yet they were not as simple as they should be. Either they should be changed, or the law relating to subscription ought to be relaxed. Either to simplify them or else to make them merely Articles of Peace are the alternatives

[1] *Pastoral Care* c. viii.

[2] *Exposition* preface, p. viii (ed. Page).

which he suggests. But, pending this reform, Burnet has a hint for those whom the Articles deter from Orders. According to the law, the Articles may be accepted in any sense consistent with their literal and grammatical meaning. Where they are ambiguous or vague, we are not bound to any one of the various possible interpretations; all are open to us, all are equally orthodox. And it is to be remembered that no layman need accept the Articles in their integrity as a condition of communicating with the Church. If satisfied in his own conscience that he believes whatever parts of them are fundamental and manifestly proved by Holy Writ he is qualified to be an Anglican[1].

Of the reforms thus suggested with a view to Comprehension there was not one which took effect. The Whigs in Parliament were favourably disposed to Burnet's schemes. But they dared not tamper with the constitution of the Church by parliamentary legislation. To do so would be to give the Nonjuring party a pretext for the cry that the Church was in danger through the Revolution. Parliament accordingly went no further than the appointment of a clerical committee to prepare a scheme for Convocation. Burnet was of course on the committee, and he entered into the work with zeal. But he was quickly undeceived as to the possibility of persuading Convocation. The Lower House was filled with the most intolerant spirits among the clergy, and Tory sympathies added virulence to their opposition. The scheme of Comprehension was thrown out[2], and Burnet's *Exposition of the Articles*, although it had received the Primate's approbation, became the subject of acrimonious resolutions[3]. For the slight to himself, Burnet cared very little. His schemes of comprehension he regretted the less because the immediate effect of the Toleration Bill was to diminish the numbers of the Nonconformists by not less than a fourth part[4]. But his failure convinced him that nothing

[1] See the *Exposition* p. 7 ff.; *Hist. of his Own Times* vi. 184; *Hist. Reform.* ii. 23.

[2] MS. Aut. fo. 212; *Hist. of his Own Times* iv. 17; Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation* p. 323; von Ranke, iv. 571.

[3] Lathbury, p. 355.

[4] *Parl. Hist.* vi. 157.

good could ever be effected through Convocation. He looked to the State as the only possible agent of reform in the future. And so he became in old age, what he certainly had not been for some years after 1688, a pronounced Erastian[1].

On the subject of the Tests he was far more conservative. The Revolution had the effect of nullifying the most serious arguments by which he had hitherto maintained them. It was in the last degree unlikely that William would risk his popularity to fill the Court and public offices with Catholics or any sect of Nonconformists. Yet to Burnet's mind the Tests were still the palladium of the British Constitution. The nightmare of a far-reaching Roman Catholic conspiracy still hung about his mind. For this there was an excuse. Only time could show that the persecuting policy of Louis XIV was an anachronism not to be imitated by Roman Catholic princes of the future. The Treaty of Utrecht was the first event which proved to the world that the diplomatic influence of the Papacy had become a negligible quantity[2]. Still, Burnet might have seen that if its adherents were really the scoundrels he supposed, no conscientious scruples would prevent them from swallowing a test; and that the exclusion of Roman Catholics from office was in theory incompatible with the admission of Dissenters. The policy for which he pleaded was a truly English one—tolerable in its practical results, but logically absurd. The Tests were to be maintained in all their stringency: but Dissenters were to be allowed the loophole of Occasional Conformity[3]. Flinching, in other words, from a formal adhesion to the theories of John Locke's *Letter on Toleration*, he was none the less well pleased to see them virtually realized.

Such then were the ideas which he upheld from 1688 until his death. As he had been the chief agent in converting the nation to Whig principles, so he was their staunchest champion

[1] MS. Aut. fo. 212: "I am now convinced that if ever our Church is to be set right it must be by some such method (a joint committee of Parliament and Convocation) and not by a majority in Convocation; for little good is to be expected from the synodical meetings of the clergy."

[2] Cf. von Ranke, *History of the Popes* book viii, § 17.

[3] See his speech of 1703 in *Parl. Hist.* vi. 157; also printed separately.

against the reactionary Toryism of Atterbury and Bolingbroke. The weapons which he used were still the same. He was an author first, and only incidentally a politician. It is true that he was much consulted by the Government, both in the lifetime of Queen Mary, whose oracle he was in all religious questions, and afterwards when her death left power in the hands of a King who had the contempt of a man of action for the man of letters. Burnet sat on the committee which advised the King in the disposal of ecclesiastical preferments. In 1698 he became the tutor of Anne's sole surviving son. He was employed to guide the debates of the Lords upon the Act of Settlement; and the Electress of Hanover looked upon him as the mainstay of her interest in England. The scheme for assisting impoverished benefices, which ultimately took the form of Queen Anne's Bounty, was adopted in consequence of his urgent representations to William, Anne, and Somers. In the reign of Anne, although he had lost his influence at Court, he once or twice appeared and spoke with astonishing effect from his place in Parliament. In 1703 he headed a successful opposition to the Act against Occasional Conformity. Seven years later, on the question of Sacheverell's impeachment, he delivered a masterly historical oration to prove that non-resistance had never been the official doctrine of the English Church[1]. And in private life he was recognized as the patriarch of the Whig party; all its most distinguished leaders resorted regularly to his house in Clerkenwell. Even as a politician he was a man of mark. But the real source of his influence lay elsewhere. Even his parliamentary speeches were composed much rather for the press than for the close circle of professional politicians. His most damaging attacks upon the High Church party were delivered in the form of pamphlets and of sermons.

It is not, however, in such writings that we find the deepest thought of his old age. He was more than a mere controversialist; religion was now, as always, more than a matter of institutions, forms, and definitions in his eyes. If he could not hope to enlarge the formularies of the Church or modify

[1] See *A Speech in the House of Lords, March* 16, $17\frac{09}{10}$ (printed 1710).

the anomalies in her legal constitution, he could still endeavour to make her spirit better than her form; to reanimate her with "the noble flame of life and joy"[1], which is kindled by earnest meditation upon Christian mysteries, and fostered by absorption in active Christian duties. The triumph of the Reformation had been due to the high conception of the inner life which it had rediscovered in the history of the early Church. If for a century the Reformation had stood still or actually receded, if schism and infidelity had paralysed the force of truth and given matter for derision to the advocates of the old errors, this was because the inner life had lost its meaning and its fascination. The malady was spiritual; so too must be the remedy. A new enthusiasm must be awakened in the clergy and communicated through them to the Church at large. This was the spirit in which Burnet entered on his administrative duties as a bishop. To obtain a better class of candidates for ordination, to ground them in a wider and more liberal range of studies, to fill them with a sense of high responsibility, to impress on them the paramount importance of a practical and active piety, to make them understand that charity is the most effectual solvent of antagonism, and unobtrusive zeal the surest road to influence, became the chief object of his thoughts. Of the clergy with whom he had to work in the meanwhile, he had the very worst opinion, and not without good cause. In respect of pastoral efficiency, he thought that all reformed communions had much to learn from Rome, none more to learn than that of England. This conviction lends a certain melancholy to the famous Conclusion of the *History of his Own Times*, in which he summarizes the lessons of his past experience and gives a final warning to posterity. The remedies of the evil are more fully discussed in *The Pastoral Care*, which he preferred to all his other writings. The subject of this little book appeals to a circle narrower than that attracted by the *History of the Reformation*. But whoever is interested in the general views of Burnet should read these works together. The *History* is a record of progress in the past, *The Pastoral*

[1] *History of his Own Times* vi. 243.

Care suggests a line of progress for the future. The lessons of *The Pastoral Care* are not substantially different from those enforced in the early *Letter to the Scottish Bishops.* But in the man of sixty there is a mellowness of thought, a weightiness and moderation of style, which we do not find in the youth of twenty-five. Whatever was most elevated and inspiring in Latitudinarian thought breathes through the pages of *The Pastoral Care.*

Yet neither golden counsels nor a genuine attempt to illustrate them in his practice could make Burnet popular with the inferior clergy. Tories and High Church almost to a man, they could not endure a Latitudinarian Whig. In 1713 Swift can say of Burnet, "he has the misfortune to be hated by every one who either wears the habit or values the profession of a clergyman"[1]. The Bishop owns that even in the diocese of Salisbury this was the truth. The clergy carried with them a considerable section of their parishioners. Once, in a sermon delivered at Salisbury, Burnet touched upon the limits of allegiance to a sovereign. The mayor and aldermen, who had come in state to hear him, rose and left the church; the congregation followed them almost to a man, and the rest of the sermon was delivered to empty benches[2]. It is not wonderful that, for the last few years of his life, he preferred London as a place of residence to his own cathedral town. Even in London unpopularity followed him to the last. At his funeral the hearse was pelted and the windows of the mourning-coaches broken by the mob[3]. The followers of Bolingbroke and Atterbury gratified their spite in pamphlets of the most scurrilous description. Their spirit is fairly reflected by an entry in Hearne's diary: "On the 17th inst. died that great villain Dr Gilbert Burnet without retracting any of his errors or begging pardon of God and good men for the mischief he had done"[4].

From such assailants we need not defend him; their hatred is a confession of his greatness. With all his failings and his

[1] *A Preface to the B–p of S–r–m's Introduction,* &c. p. 56.
[2] Hearne's MSS. col. xxiv. 214.
[3] Lathbury, *Hist. of Nonjurors* p. 75.
[4] Hearne's MSS. liii. 98.

blunders, Burnet belongs to the giant race before the flood. We may criticize him for a want of faith in the power of religion to hold its own without extraneous supports, and for too much faith in the power of conventional beliefs. We may grant that he would have been more permanently useful if he had been less politically minded. There is something to depress and chill us in his distrust of the speculative reason. The religious life has heights and depths which lay beyond his purview. When all these reservations have been made, Burnet remains historically an important, morally an attractive, figure. The English Church has produced some minds of a finer texture, more audacious, more profound, but none more typical or more devoted to her service.

VIII

JOSEPH BUTLER

1692–1752

BY

HENRY WACE, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST MICHAEL, CORNHILL
AND PREBENDARY OF ST PAUL'S

JOSEPH BUTLER

In attempting to appreciate, in any degree, the position and work of Bishop Butler, it is essential to realize at the outset the circumstances with which he had to deal, and the object he proposed to himself. These circumstances, as painfully apprehended and described by himself, presented a general decay of religious belief and practice. The advertisement prefixed to the first edition of the *Analogy*, in 1736, expresses his view of the case. "It is come," he says, "I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." But an even more melancholy account of the matter is contained in the opening of the remarkable charge which he delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Durham at his primary visitation in 1751. He there says: "It is impossible for me, my brethren, upon our first meeting of this kind, to forbear lamenting with you the general decay of religion in this nation; which is now observed by every one, and has been for some time the complaint of all serious persons. The influence of it is more and more wearing out of the minds of men, even of those who do not pretend to enter into speculations upon the subject; but the number of those who do, and who profess themselves unbelievers, increases, and with their numbers their zeal. Zeal, it is

natural to ask—for what? Why, truly *for* nothing, but *against* everything that is good and sacred amongst us"[1]. He says he knows not how often the professed enemies of religion may come in the way of his clergy; but he adds, "often enough, I fear, in the way of some at least amongst you, to require consideration, what is the proper behaviour towards them. One would, to be sure, avoid great familiarities with these persons, especially if they affect to be licentious and profane in their common talk"[2]; and he further speaks of "the want of religion in the generality of the common people"[3].

It is evident, from the tone in which Butler makes these observations, how deeply this state of things weighed on his mind. It was a mind of profoundly religious temper, of deep reverence and humble piety. His two sermons "Upon Piety or the Love of God," preached, it should be remembered, not at the close of his career, but at the opening of it, contained in those *Sermons at the Rolls* which were his first publication, and printed in 1726, when he was only thirty-four, are a striking illustration of the depth and intensity of his religious feelings. Take only the following passage[4]: "Consider wherein that presence of a friend consists, which has often so strong an effect as wholly to possess the mind, and entirely suspend all other affections and regards; and which itself affords the highest satisfaction and enjoyment. He is within reach of the senses. Now, as our capacities of perception improve, we shall have, perhaps by some faculty entirely new, a perception of God's presence with us in a nearer and stricter way; since it is certain He is more intimately present with us than anything else can be. Proof of the existence and presence of any being is quite different from the immediate perception, the consciousness of it. What, then, will be the joy of heart which His presence, and 'the light of His countenance,' Who is the life of the Universe, will inspire good men with, when

[1] *Bishop Butler's Works, A new Edition with Preface and Notes*, by J. H. Bernard, D.D., in *The English Theological Library* (edited by F. Relton, A.K.C.) i. 278. All the references in this essay are to this edition.

[2] Ibid. i. 288. [3] Ibid. i. 292. [4] Ibid. i. 187.

they shall have a sensation, that He is the sustainer of their being, that they exist in Him; when they shall feel His influence to cheer and enliven and support their frame, in a manner of which we have now no conception. He will be in a literal sense 'their strength and their portion for ever.'" It would seem of the utmost importance to bear this in mind, if justice is to be done to Butler's point of view and motive. He is too often treated as a cold and prudential reasoner, who is content with a cool argument to show that the balance of probabilities is on the side of Christianity. The fact is, he is a man of the most intense earnestness, absorbed in devotion to God, desirous, as he wrote in some touching fragments which are preserved in the British Museum[1], "to discern the hand of God in everything, and to have a due sense of it"; to "hunger and thirst after righteousness till filled with it, by being made partaker of the Divine nature"; to "have a due sense of the hand of God in everything, and then put myself into His hand to lead me through whatever ways He shall think fit, either to add to my burden, or lighten it, or wholly discharge me of it."

To a man with this spirit and this feeling, the spectacle of a society, the society of his own country, falling away into irreligion, neglecting, if not spurning, the God in whom the very life of his soul consisted, was one of infinite pain and distress; and it is this sense of distress, alternating with grief and indignation, which breaks out again and again in severe passages and expressions throughout the *Analogy*, as when he says, for instance, towards the end of the first part[2]: "These things, which, it is to be remembered, are matters of fact, ought, in all common sense, to awaken mankind; to induce them to consider in earnest their condition, and what they have to do. It is absurd, absurd to the degree of being ridiculous, if the subject were not of so serious a kind, for men to think themselves secure in a vicious life; or even in that immoral thoughtlessness, which far the greatest part of them are fallen into. And the credibility of religion, arising from experience and facts here considered, is fully sufficient, in reason, to engage them to live in the general practice of all virtue and

[1] *Works* i. 307, 308. [2] Ibid. ii. 134.

piety; under the serious apprehension, though it should be mixed with some doubt, of a righteous administration established in nature, and a future judgement in consequence of it." What we are sensible of, in a passage like this, is not the reasoner, or the philosopher, refuting a false argument or defending a theological truth. It is a devout and earnest man appalled at the thoughtlessness, as much as at the viciousness, of the men of his day; and appealing to them, from his own deep sense of religious and moral realities, to look at least at the reason of the matter, if they will not look higher. Such was his starting-point and his motive. His one supreme object is to revive the sense of religion and of its obligations. What was the method which he proposed for this purpose?

Judging not merely by his writings, but by the order of them, that method appears to be twofold. His first publication, in the year 1726, was his *Sermons at the Rolls*; a wonderful production, it may be observed in passing, for a man to have written between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-four. He asks his contemporaries to consider, in the first place, what is the human nature which it was the tendency of the day to cut loose from all obligations of religion, and too frequently, at the same time, from those of morality. He does not venture to interpose amidst the confused passions of London licentiousness and scepticism with arguments derived from the authority of religion. He speaks to the men of his day, in the first instance, neither as prophet nor as priest. In the circles in which he moved, and in the temper of the times, in neither of those capacities, perhaps, would he have obtained a due hearing. That work fell to Wesley and the great Evangelical leaders, whose career began in its full force in the later years of Butler's life, and owed, perhaps, much to the manner in which he had ploughed the ground. But he is content, at that critical moment in our religious history, to teach the men of his day to know themselves: to ask themselves what their nature was, what was its constitution, and the obligations which were revealed by a due consideration of it. He calls upon them to observe, as a simple matter of fact, that that nature is not merely a bundle of passions, desires,

and capacities, but a combination of such desires and capacities in a certain order, and with relative subordination, and that there is one principle which asserts an imperative and indisputable claim to govern all the others. "Conscience," he teaches, "does not only offer itself to show us the way we should walk in, but it likewise carries its own authority with it, that it is our natural guide; the guide assigned us by the author of our nature; it therefore belongs to our condition of being, it is our duty to walk in that path, and follow this guide, without looking about to see whether we may not possibly forsake them with impunity"[1]. This principle is practically coincident with true self-love. "Conscience and self-love, if we understand our true happiness, always lead us the same way"[2].

But though Butler thus acknowledges that an enlightened self-love, taking into account the next world as well as this, would direct us aright, he insists on the fact that conscience is our only safe practical guide; and the great feature in human nature on which he insists is the existence in it of this principle of authority. It is not merely a man's interest to pursue a moral course, but it is his undeniable obligation to do so. It is striking to compare his description of human nature in this respect with Pope's almost contemporary *Essay on Man*, published in 1733, just four years after Butler's Preface to the second edition of his *Sermons*. There the principle of self-love is recognized as not merely the true but the actual governing power in human nature:

> "That reason, passion answer one great aim,
> That true self-love and social are the same,
> That virtue only makes our bliss below,
> And all our knowledge is ourselves to know."

These lines, with which the *Essay on Man* concludes, coincide to some extent with Butler's teaching. But the principle of obligation, the supremacy of conscience, finds no place, or a wholly secondary place, in Pope's view of human nature; and Butler's insistence on this principle was his first great step in rallying the men of pleasure and scepticism in his day

[1] *Works* i. 54. [2] Ibid. i. 57.

to a more serious and religious view of life. At their feast of reckless self-pleasure, he confronts them with the spectre of authority, an authority within their own breasts; and because it is an authority within their own breasts, one which bespeaks the authority of the power which made them what they are: the authority, in plain words, of their Maker and their God. To arrest the general break-up of private and social morality it was ineffectual simply to urge, in Pope's fine epigrams and plausible arguments, that true self-love and social are the same. It was necessary to open men's eyes, as Balaam's were opened by the angel, to the moral authority, the angel of the Lord, which was standing across their path, and demanding their allegiance. Butler shows them that the nature, which they talk of following, is overshadowed and controlled at every point by this authority; that that very nature, the conscience in their own breasts, warns them of judgement, threatens them with penalties for disobedience to its dictates; and that thus, in a word, if they know themselves, they must know that they are under government.

At this stage in his career, he does not press the point much further. He proceeds, in other sermons, to illustrate, in various particular instances, the manner in which the constitution of our nature, which he assumes to be from God, reveals to those who will attend to its simple and unperverted dictates, the outlines of that duty to our neighbour and to our God, which was made light of by the men of his day. Whether he is treating of compassion, or resentment, or forgiveness of injuries, or the love of our neighbour, or even when he rises to the highest point, that of the love of God—in each case his argument is not dogmatic, but is entirely based upon the facts, the phenomena, which are presented by nature and human nature. One example, from the highest of all arguments, respecting the love of God, may be sufficient. "If," he says[1], "you can lay aside that general, confused, undeterminate notion of happiness, as consisting in such possessions, and fix in your thoughts that it really can consist in nothing but in a faculty's having its proper object; you will

[1] *Works* i. 184.

clearly see, that in the coolest way of consideration, without either the heat of fanciful enthusiasm, or the warmth of real devotion, nothing is more certain, than that an infinite Being may Himself be, if He pleases, the supply to all the capacities of our nature. . . . As our understanding can contemplate itself, and our affections be exercised upon themselves by reflection, so may each be employed in the same manner upon any other mind; and since the supreme Mind, the Author and Cause of all things, is the highest possible object to Himself, He may be an adequate supply to all the faculties of our souls; a subject to our understanding, and an object to our affections." Even this high argument, it will be seen, is built up upon the simple observation of the facts of our nature; and the lofty devotions of the royal Prophet, with which the sermon concludes, are thus shown to be entirely in conformity with the analogy of human nature—proportionate, that is, to the facts and capacities which we actually observe in it.

Such was the first of Butler's appeals to the thoughtless irreligion of his day. He threw a great light upon the constitution and position of human nature; and from the day those sermons were published, they have promoted the great practical purpose Butler had in view, in steadying all minds that are capable of serious thought, and illustrating the harmony between human nature and the Christian conception of duty and religion. But if the Christian religion, as a whole, was to be similarly supported and reasserted, it was obviously requisite to deal with it in a more comprehensive manner, and to approach its consideration in a more direct method. The main principles, and the general method, by which Butler proposed to rally the men of his day to a due regard to Christianity, are indeed simply, and as it were artlessly, employed in the *Sermons*; and one cardinal point in this method is distinctly stated in the preface to the second edition of the *Sermons*. "There are," he says [1], "two ways in which the subject of morals may be treated. One begins from inquiring into the abstract relations of things; the other from a matter of fact, namely, what

[1] *Works* i. 4.

the particular nature of man is, its several parts, their economy or constitution; from whence it proceeds to determine what course of life it is, which is correspondent to this whole nature." But before this method could be employed on a larger scale, and applied to religion as a whole, it was necessary to enlarge its scope and justify its applicability. The facts and phenomena in the nature of individual human beings are, in the main, simply a matter of careful observation. They are within the scope of each man's experience; and all that is requisite is an honest and good heart, a single eye, to recognize them when pointed out. But if we are to pass to morality and religion on so vast a scale as that of the Christian Revelation —as they are applied, that is, to the whole world, and to the future as well as the present—we are at once beyond the limits of immediate and personal observation, and we must employ some method of inference on a large scale, some method on which we can rely in reasoning from facts we can observe and verify, to those we cannot. This method was found by Butler in the principle of probability, which is based on that of likeness or analogy. He recognizes, as the great fact in our position, that "to Us, probability is the very guide of life"[1]. But he means by probability not mere guess-work, but the careful calculation of what is likely to be true, or unlikely, upon the basis of facts which we have observed. "That," he says, "which chiefly constitutes Probability is expressed in the word 'Likely,' i.e. like some truth, or true event; like it, in itself, in its evidence, in some more or fewer of its circumstances"[2]. This he expresses by the word *Analogy*, as in the instance he gives[3], that "whereas the Prince who had always lived in a warm climate, naturally concluded in the way of analogy, that there was no such thing as water's becoming hard, because he had always observed it to be fluid and yielding: we, on the contrary, from analogy conclude, that there is no presumption at all against this: that it is supposable there may be frost in England any given day in January next, probable that there will on some day in the month; and that there is a moral certainty, i.e. ground for

[1] *Works* ii. 2. [2] Ibid. ii. 1. [3] Ibid. ii. 2.

an expectation, without any doubt of it, in some part or other of the winter."

Now, it will be found of much interest and importance to observe, at this point, that what Butler is really doing in applying this argument, is to introduce, for the purposes of religion, that great method of Induction which had just produced such momentous results in the sphere of physical science. The argument of the great book to which we are now passing, that of *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, receives, in more respects than one, a most vivid illustration, if it is considered in connexion with the immense advance in physical science, which was made in Butler's own day. He was a later contemporary of Newton. The third edition of Newton's *Principia*, the last published in his lifetime, appeared in 1726, the very year in which, at the age of thirty-four, Butler published his *Sermons at the Rolls*. There are clear traces, both in the *Sermons* and in the *Analogy*, of the effect which the great discoveries of Newton had produced on his mind. In the characteristic sermon already referred to, upon the love of God, he exclaims: "What amazing wonders are opened to view by late improvements! What an object is the universe to a creature, if there be a creature who can comprehend its system!"[1] In the chapter in the *Analogy* on the moral government of God, there is a reference which will be seen presently to be of still more importance, as illustrating the effect of the Newtonian discoveries on his thought. He says[2]: "Suppose all this advantageous tendency of virtue to become effect, amongst one or more orders of creatures, in any distant scenes and periods, and to be seen by any orders of vicious creatures, throughout the universal kingdom of God; this happy effect of virtue would have a tendency, by way of example, and possibly in other ways, to amend those of them who are capable of amendment, and being recovered to a just sense of virtue. If our notions of the plan of Providence were enlarged in any sort proportionable to what late discoveries have enlarged our views with respect to the

[1] *Works* i. 186. [2] Ibid. ii. 61.

material world, representations of this kind would not appear absurd or extravagant."

In fact, the Newtonian system, to thoughtful men at all events, held in Butler's age a position similar to that which the Darwinian theory has held in our own, and perhaps a more important one, as it rested, in the main, on practical demonstration. A unity had been introduced into the whole of the vast universe opened to our gaze. Pope's extravagant epitaph serves, by its very extravagance, to indicate the effect which was produced on men's minds:

> "Nature and Nature's Laws lay hid in Night;
> GOD said, *Let Newton be!* and all was Light."

But by what method had these amazing discoveries been made? It is instructive, in answering that question, to put side by side a famous passage from Newton, and an equally famous one from Bishop Butler. Newton, in the great *Scholium*, or Note, at the end of the *Principia*, says, in reference to the force of gravity: "I have not yet been able to deduce the reason of these properties of gravity from phenomena, and I do not frame hypotheses—*hypotheses non fingo*—for whatever is not deduced from phenomena must be called hypothesis; and hypotheses, whether metaphysical or physical, or of occult qualities, or mechanical, have no place in *experimental philosophy*. In this philosophy propositions are deduced from phenomena, and are rendered general by induction. . . . And it is enough that gravity really exists, and acts according to the laws we have expounded, and that it suffices for all the motions of the heavenly bodies and of our ocean." That is Newton's account of his method. Now let us listen to Butler's account of his own. "Forming," he says[1], "our notions of the constitution and government of the world upon reasoning, without foundation for the principles we assume, whether from the attributes of God, or anything else, is building a world upon hypothesis, like Descartes. Forming our notions upon reasoning from principles which are certain, but applied to cases to which we have no ground to apply them (like those who explain the structure of the human

[1] *Works* ii. 5.

body, and the nature of diseases and medicines from mere mathematics without sufficient data), is an error much akin to the former: since what is assumed in order to make the reasoning applicable, is hypothesis. But it must be allowed just, to join abstract reasonings with the observation of facts, and argue from such facts as are known, to others that are like them; from that part of the Divine government over intelligent creatures which comes under our view, to that larger and more general government over them which is beyond it; and from what is present, to collect what is likely, credible, or not incredible, will be hereafter." This description of "what will be allowed just" would not be an inadequate description of the method of the *Principia*. In point of fact, it is familiar to every one how Newton's discovery of the general law of gravitation is an extension, to the motions of the heavenly bodies, of the law by which, within our immediate observation, bodies fall to the earth, by which, according to the familiar story, an apple falls to the ground. It is the result of a vast induction, in which "abstract reasonings are joined with the observation of facts"; and by means of which forces operating within our immediate experience on this earth are regarded as extending throughout the whole visible universe. That extension was, at least at first, by no means in the nature of an absolute demonstration. For a while it remained, at least to some extent, a matter of probability[1]. But as the observations extended, and further phenomena were observed, the induction became more complete and more sure; until now it is a received axiom that the law of gravitation extends to the remotest regions of space.

Here, then, in this immense scientific movement, was a suggestion and an example for an appeal to the facts of life on

[1] "The theory of universal gravitation advanced by Newton . . . is, from its nature, insusceptible of direct demonstration, and could only be established by showing that the phenomena of nature were in no instance opposed to such a supposition, and that it was sufficient to the explanation of those phenomena. Newton did much towards this, but the completion of the proof required the labours of many succeeding mathematicians and astronomers" (*English Cyclopaedia*, s.v. *Newton*, col. 471).

a large scale; and, whether consciously or unconsciously, Butler followed Newton's method. It is clear that he was sensible of the practical novelty of his method, from the careful explanation he gives, at the outset, of the character of an argument from probability and analogy. He makes the observation that it is not his design "to inquire further into the nature, the foundation, and measure of probability . . . or to guard against the errors to which reasoning from analogy is liable"[1]. This, he says, "belongs to the subject of Logic; and is a branch of that subject which has not yet been thoroughly considered." In point of fact, the laws of inductive reasoning, of which analogy is a particular case, were not thoroughly investigated until our own day; when the immense extension of inductive reasoning, on all subjects, created a call for such extensions of logical theory as were furnished by the works of Mill. Theology, up to Butler's time, had been almost entirely a subject of deductive reasoning. Even Lord Bacon, who gave the chief impulse to inductive modes of thought, positively denied their applicability to theology. "Sacred theology," he says, "is grounded only upon the word and oracle of God, and not upon the light of nature"; and he further states that "after the articles and principles of religion are placed and exempted from examination of reason, it is then permitted unto us to make derivations and inferences from, and according to, the analogy of them, for our better direction"[2]. But this sort of theological argument, exercised in discussions and deductions too often far-fetched, and based on an uncritical use of texts of Scripture, had been carried to such an extreme, first by the Schoolmen and then in the bitter controversies of the century which followed the Reformation, that men were thoroughly sick of it, and had lost all confidence in it as a practical guide. Indeed, this sense of disgust, and a distrust of mere logic, were important elements in that general aversion from religion which Butler had to lament. Quite apart, therefore, from his results, the method he adopted was, at least on such

[1] *Works* ii. 3.

[2] *Advancement of Learning* Book II. chap. xxv. 1, 3.

a scale, an entirely new departure. It appealed, even in respect to theological truths, to that light of nature on which Bacon said they were not grounded; and it opened up new ground of thought and discussion, which was instinctively felt to be in harmony with the great scientific movement of the age.

This method, as has been intimated, is the key to the *Sermons on Human Nature.* There Butler had observed the phenomena of each man's individual nature, as they were open to his own observation, and had pointed out, from those facts, what was the real constitution and system of that nature. But in the *Analogy* he applies this method on the largest possible scale. After dwelling sufficiently, even if on some points tentatively, on "that which is the foundation of all our hopes and all our fears; all our hopes and fears which are of any consideration; I mean," he says [1], "a future life"; he passes to consider the facts of life with respect to the moral order which may be observed in them. He points out that "the fact of our case, which we find by experience, is that the Author of Nature actually exercises dominion or government over us at present, by rewarding or punishing us for our actions, in as strict and proper a sense of those words, and even in the same sense, as children, servants, subjects are rewarded and punished by those who govern them. And thus the whole analogy of nature, the whole present course of things, most fully shews, that there is nothing incredible in the general doctrine of religion, that God will reward and punish men for their actions hereafter. . . . For the whole course of nature is a present instance of His exercising that government over us, which implies in it rewarding and punishing" [2].

Let it be observed that this mode of reasoning is something quite different from what is sometimes represented as the sum and substance of Butler's argument: namely, that if there are difficulties in believing the declarations of religion that God will reward and punish us hereafter, there are the same difficulties in a view of life which supposes that he rewards and punishes us here. That turn may be given to the argument from time

[1] *Works* ii. 10. [2] Ibid. ii. 39.

to time, as a special and *ad hominem* answer to the deists against whom he is contending. But Butler, it will be seen, is mainly concerned with something much more serious than a dialectical retort, which is two-edged, and which, as he must have been quite acute enough to see, might, as a mere logical argument, be turned against his own premisses. He is concerned, like Newton, with urging, that laws which prevail here, in this world, within the range of our experience, may very probably, if we remain the same creatures, with the same natures, prevail hereafter in any other world into which we may pass. That is a positive piece of induction, imperfect, as all induction is at first, especially in regions of moral observation, but carrying with it a distinct positive weight and presumption. Then he passes, in the same way, to observe the facts in this world of the moral government of God, and shows, from the actual facts of life and of society, that there is a kind of moral government involved in that natural government of God which he had first considered; that, in this world, under the actual constitution of human nature, virtue and vice are naturally rewarded and punished as beneficial or mischievous to society, and rewarded and punished directly as virtue and vice. The notion of a moral scheme of government is thus shown to be suggested to our thoughts by the ordinary constitution and course of nature; the execution of this scheme is actually begun under our own observation; and these things give a credibility to the supposition of actions being similarly rewarded and punished hereafter, and in higher degrees than they are here. From these things, he further adds, joined with the moral nature which God has given us, considered as given us by Him, arises a practical proof that the scheme will be completed—a proof, as he says, from fact. Then he passes to illustrate from the facts of our present daily life that we are in a state of probation, and under moral discipline; that even here we are prepared by the trials and discipline we undergo in this life for the positions we are to occupy, and for the duties we are to perform; and accordingly he concludes it to be perfectly credible, from the analogy of nature, that our case

may be the same with respect to the happiness of a future state, and the qualifications requisite for it.

It is not necessary here to pursue the argument in detail. These illustrations seem sufficient to exhibit that characteristic of it, to which it is chiefly important that our attention should be directed: namely, that it is throughout a positive argument from induction, and is precisely of the same nature as that by which Newton's thoughts were led, from the observation of gravitation in this world, to the conception of gravitation extending throughout the universe. The Moral Law, and all its sanctions, as declared by the Christian religion, are to Butler the law of gravitation of the spiritual universe. This short scene of existence, in the present world, is one part of a vast moral whole, all compacted together in one grand constitution, or, as he generally speaks, scheme or system; and from the part of it which is under our eyes in this world, he draws a presumption respecting the nature of the parts of it which are invisible. As he repeatedly admits, it is not a proof, it is only an inductive presumption; but it is a real and positive presumption, and is fitted to produce a profound impression on those who give it due attention. Let a man read the *Analogy*, as Butler bids him read it, not as a theological argument with opponents—who are, in fact, kept very much in the background—but as an appeal to a fair man's observations of the phenomena of life, and he will find it a most wonderful and impressive commentary on the facts of our daily experience. It can hardly fail to produce a sense of profound awe to listen to Butler, as he is lifting the veil from the realities of the moral world, in which we live and move and have our being; as he is calling men away, not merely from their pleasures or their speculations, but from all their external and temporal interests, to observe the moral drama of life in which they are engaged, the moral consequences which, whether they will or no, they are daily entailing on themselves and others, and the terrible possibilities to which, even here, these moral experiences and trials expose them. Then he turns upon them again and again, asking whether, with these daily realities in full view, they dare live as if there were

nothing in those warnings of future consequences of which religion speaks—warnings which they may see are in full harmony with the experiences of the present life. In his modest, but yet profoundly impressive language: "Thus much at least will be here found, not taken for granted, but proved, that any reasonable man, who will thoroughly consider the matter, may be as much assured, as he is of his own being, that it is not, however, so clear a case that there is nothing in it. . . . And the practical consequence to be drawn from this is not attended to by every one who is concerned in it"[1].

"The practical consequence": that is what Butler was concerned with from first to last, from his first *Sermon on Human Nature* to the last page of the *Analogy*. He would rouse the thoughtless world of his day to the dread moral realities by which they were surrounded, both in the constitution of their own nature, and in the constitution of the society and the world around them, and induce them to pause in their reckless course of pleasure and loose speculation. In that effort he succeeded. If it may be so expressed, he staggered the world, and made it think and reflect. He effectually prevented the world in general from talking about the duties of individuals and the moral and religious obligations of society, as if there were nothing in the warnings and revelations of Christianity. The positive message of the Gospel, its evangelical blessings, were soon to be brought home to men's minds by other lips and in another method. But in an age when the very foundations of religion were endangered, Butler may be said to have, to a large extent, laid them anew, on deeper and firmer ground. The title of Newton's great work was *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. Butler's work, including the *Sermons* and the *Analogy* in one view, may best be regarded as exhibiting *The Moral Principles of Religious Philosophy*; and as all natural science has since proceeded, and must proceed, on the principles expounded by Newton, so the truest theology, the theology which appeals to men's business and

[1] Advertisement to the *Analogy*: *Works* II. xviii.

bosoms, has, since Butler's day, proceeded on the lines he laid down, and must ever rest on them. It must be an inductive theology. It must rest on the practical experience of the human heart; it must show that the revelations of the Old and New Testaments correspond to the facts of human nature, and are their only adequate explanation; it must exhibit the analogy between this world and the next, between our daily experience and our eternal hopes and fears.

IX

WILLIAM WARBURTON

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

1698–1779

BY

J. NEVILLE FIGGIS, M.A.

RECTOR OF MARNHULL, DORSET

WILLIAM WARBURTON

It is not the greatest men who are the most perfect reflection of their age. They rise above it. Doubtless even the greatest owes much to his environment. We fail to understand such a man as Julius Caesar in the practical world, or Plato in the intellectual, without some knowledge of the atmosphere philosophical or political which furnished their energy with its material. More and more are we learning that to realize the life on earth of our Lord Himself careful study must be made of the conditions under which it was lived. Still it is true in the main that the man of the highest type belongs to no age because he belongs to all, and is less than meaner men deflected from his course by the prejudices of prevailing notions. But in order to understand the past we need to find the prejudices and limitations of an age as well as its finer characteristics preserved for us as in a mirror. This mirror is commonly to be furnished by the life and writings of some man endowed above his fellows, so that he can express what others unconsciously or inconsistently practise, yet at the same time so limited by the immediate conditions of his day that he is unable to rise above them, and is without sufficient moral force to withstand the characteristic bias of the age. It is this truth that gives its interest to the subject of my lecture.

Warburton was not great[1] as Berkeley and Butler and

[1] Nor had he the insight to recognize intellectual greatness. His remarks on Hume are full of unconscious irony: "I am strongly tempted to have a stroke at Hume in parting. . . . But does he deserve notice? Is he known amongst you? Pray, answer me these questions. For if his own weight keeps him down, I should be sorry to contribute to his advancement to any

Hume were great; but he was to the churchmanship of the day something of what Bolingbroke was to its unbelief. He carried to their logical conclusion premises of which the average man admitted the force without understanding the significance, and rendered articulate sentiments vaguely and unintelligently entertained by the majority. In spite therefore of the fact that his work has not been enduring in admitted influence, and that the protagonist of so many fights has been conquered not by logic but by oblivion, Warburton is a figure not only of some interest to the student of human nature, but of no mean importance to the historian of politico-ecclesiastical ideas.

For his writings express for us with a fidelity, of which he was unaware, certain of the most important and characteristic aspects of the eighteenth century. It would not be possible within the limits of a lecture to go into all the facts of a life in some ways so crowded, still less to sketch the course of the thousand controversies which were to Warburton as the breath of his nostrils. But an examination of his most notable works and some of his letters may illustrate the view that through Warburton we can learn something of the political and religious atmosphere of the mid-eighteenth century, and can see some of the points in which the English Church then differed from that of either Caroline or Victorian days.

First then a little as to the general conditions of the time. It must of course be remembered that no estimate of this sort is adequate. Any attempt to combine the characteristic features of a particular period into a bird's-eye view is liable to mislead us, unless we bear in mind that we are describing merely the dominant tendencies of the time, and that these are crossed by other and very different tendencies, which are partly the heritage of the day that is done, partly the herald of that which is coming, and partly the result of the fact that as all ages are composed of human beings, no age, like no individual, is absolutely lacking in any single element of those which enter into human life and society. Still in general we may

place but the pillory": *Letters to Hurd*, second edition, 1809, p. 14. The full title of the book as published was *Letters from a late Eminent Prelate to one of his Friends.*

describe the eighteenth century as the calm between two storms. The fever of the religious revolution (and in that we may include our own glorious revolution) was over, that of the political and industrial revolution had not begun. Perhaps, to be strictly accurate, this description should be confined to the period between the English Revolution and the beginnings of those industrial movements which changed the face of the earth, ushered in a new period of political and economic unrest, and rendered a socialistic ideal, if not a practicable, at least a plausible solution for the problems created by an individualist and capitalist system. In order to understand the eighteenth century it is necessary to remember that it was as remote from the dream of Karl Marx and Lassalle and the conditions which rendered the dream a possibility, as it was from that of a Church imperial, imprescriptible, infallible, which dazzled the eyes and directed the steps of John Henry Newman. On the other hand, to the eighteenth century the ideals of a Prynne or a Baillie seemed as absurd as they were tyrannical. The rigid predestinarianism that was of the essence of the Puritan faith had given place to an optimism common both to divines and freethinkers. Warburton never seems to consider the possibility of Calvinistic doctrine being true. Fond as he was of smiting his adversaries on the hip, he did not dream of wasting powder and shot on so out-worn an enemy. He merely alludes to "the most absurd opinion that ever was, the anti-Pelagian doctrine of St Austin," and in another place speaks of "the fanatical idea of a *favoured elect*, which never existed but in over-heated brains, where reward and punishment are distributed, not on the proportions of merit and demerit, but on the diabolic dreams of certain eternal decrees of election and reprobation, unrelated to any human principle of justice"[1]. However much he might despise or affect to despise his opponents Warburton would not have written thus, had Calvinism been at that time a living force. His language argues it as remote from eighteenth-century thought, as metempsychosis. The same thing, though in a less degree, may be said of the views of the seventeenth-century opponents

[1] *Divine Legation* iv. 423 (fourth edition, London 1754, in 6 vols.).

of Puritanism. That portrait of Laud, which has done such ill service to the historical reputation of Macaulay, is really of interest, for it is a survival of an attitude which could not have been uncommon in the days of his father. Indeed, in estimating Macaulay's personal equation we are too apt to leave out of account the fact that he was brought up among the Clapham sect, of which he retained the prejudices after shedding the opinions. As I said, if, as Mr Gardiner has shown, Macaulay's Laud is a fancy caricature with little or no relation to the facts of the seventeenth century, it is a very fair photograph of the picture that was present to the defective imagination of the eighteenth or of most of it. For the Nonjurors were a survival; they carried into an alien atmosphere the hopes and ideals of a vanished world. Wesley was a herald, the founder not so much of Wesleyanism as of undenominationalism: far more akin to the nineteenth than to the eighteenth century, he illustrates what I said of the errors we should be led into if we take the truly great man as necessarily typical of any age. Wesley was fighting for the future just as the Nonjurors were dreaming of the past. It was Warburton who represented the then existing state of things. His was that faith in "the present happy constitution of Church and State" which led men to regard "revolution principles," as they were called, as the ark of the Covenant, and existing political machinery as the *ne plus ultra* of human wisdom. This sense, which led Burke to oppose all Parliamentary reform and to a certain degree justifies the gibe of Mr Swinburne about the British constitution being a bride from heaven, once for all "delivered to the saints," was at once the cause and the consequence of that facile optimism which was so prominent a characteristic of the politics and theology of the age. In regard to religion this optimism had its outcome in a certain coldness, and a lack of that kind of zeal which wherever exhibited is missionary in its nature, and even in dislike and opposition to it, as is illustrated by the treatment of Wesley by Warburton on the one hand and Horace Walpole on the other.

Such a spirit is essentially prosaic. For romance always implies the sense of something lacking, and an entirely

comfortable world cannot have that ideal vision, which is the *sine qua non* for achievement of the highest kind, whether in religion or art. But the general feeling of the eighteenth century was one of carelessness as to the need and even the existence of nobler forms of effort than its own. The final satisfaction of men's needs in society had arrived. Details of course might be improved; and human error and human wrongdoing would need still further to be eradicated. But these were minor matters. The foundations of civil and religious liberty had been established. Their compatibility with law and order had been demonstrated by experience. The corruptions of the Middle Ages—of course they were entirely corrupt—had been removed. The evils of a fanatical Puritanism had been effectively counteracted. The State was so contrived as adequately to satisfy the temporal needs of man. The Church had realized at last its due functions and was unlikely ever again to overstep its frontier. Society was founded upon a due subordination of classes, which, with whatever deductions for crime or isolated poverty, left little scope for schemes of general reconstruction and no need for social reform. The rich man was secured against arbitrary interference by the safeguards of liberty, and against popular insubordination by those of property. All things were for the best in the best of all possible worlds, except the mischievous activity of those who wanted to make them better. Harmony had at length been reached between the interests of the individual and society. The thought, which was to govern the great work of Adam Smith, is in fact the quintessence of the eighteenth-century view of the world. A like harmony between Church and State had also been secured. All that remained was to inquire into the fundamental principles on which the existing structure was based, and to buttress by irrefragable arguments the twin fortresses of civil government and the established Church. The age was thus one of reasoning, if not of reason, and was entirely unhistorical in its whole attitude[1]. Other ages indeed seemed

[1] Take for instance the following remark from Warburton's Charge: "Church history making an important part of our theologic studies, the antiquarian

to have had no use at all except to prove the excellence of the eighteenth century and to serve as a warning to their posterity. The evils of undue emotion had been proved in the last century, for the Divine right of kings, the Puritan ideal, and the Roman Catholic system were all alike absurd and antiquated. "Enthusiasm" was "the cursed ungodliness of zeal," as Young put it; and so far from sympathizing with its nobility of aim, nothing but contempt seems to have been felt for what Warburton defines as "that state of mind in which the imagination gets the better of the judgement." So far as it had ideal aims, those of the eighteenth century were for an even temper, moderate views, and a good digestion. "The common sense of most should hold a fretful world in awe," and there was no need to dream of the Parliament of Man in the future, when everything of importance had been secured in the present. Reasoning without sympathy and without subtlety was inevitably the characteristic of men too much occupied with admiring themselves to think of any one else. They were quite clear as to what was good and bad, quite certain that all other views were not only false but ridiculous, the property of madmen and hypocrites [1]. Nor was it unnatural that, after a political revolution effected largely in order to the protection of religion, theological controversy should take a political colouring. The great controversy of the day was that between Christianity and Deism. But neither the Deist nor his Christian opponent rose above the conception of God as essentially a lawgiver and a politician. To both parties God was a remote being, and thought of as in separation from the world [2]. Indeed on the principles common

who delights to solace himself in the benighted days of monkish owl-light sometimes passes for the Divine": *Works* v. 592 (in 7 vols., London 1788).

[1] For instance, observe Warburton's allusion to a writer, Rousseau, whose influence, whatever his merits, has been ten thousand times greater than his own: "I should be well pleased particularly, to see so seraphic a madman attack so insufferable a coxcomb as Walpole; and I think they are only fit for one another": *Letters to Hurd* 387.

[2] It was largely the Covenant of the Old Testament that formed the support and indeed the source of the theory of the original contract. There is an interesting illustration of the recoil of political thought into the theological sphere where Warburton declares that Solomon's prayer at the

to both, the Deist often had the best of the argument, for that conception of the Divine Immanence which dominates Christian thought to-day was alien from the whole temper of the eighteenth century. Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*, or the writings of Mr Illingworth in our own day, would have been merely meaningless to an age which, despite its dislike of Calvinism, had not really rid itself of that conception of God as a sovereign political authority, which lies at the basis of Calvin's scheme, and had never realized the purposes of Christ's life in regard to humanity in the way that such books as *Ecce Homo* and the *Gospel of the Resurrection* have helped this generation to do. For everything of the nature of mysticism was abhorrent to an age which deified "the abstraction of the understanding," and of which the poetic spirit has been well described:

> "When Phoebus touched the poet's trembling ear
> With one supreme commandment, 'Be thou clear.'"

Its serenity would have been disturbed by the intellectual passion of Pascal no less than by the spiritual emotion of Fénélon. In spite of much philosophizing it was emphatically an unphilosophical age and not capable of dealing with metaphysical problems. Bolingbroke, the teacher of Voltaire, fell an easy victim to Warburton, yet he had a great repute as a thinker, and whether Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* or Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* would be regarded nowadays as serious works may be doubted (in spite of Mr Robertson). There were of course exceptions, but even Hume would probably have been irritated by Kant and infuriated by Lotze. With admirable lucidity and force the men of the eighteenth century could set forth and justify whatever they understood. But they did not readily understand what was not before their eyes, nor did they think it at all a duty to make the attempt. It was an age, as I said, of common-sense, a quality eminently useful in certain spheres of practice and a wholesome corrective of theory, but apt to be sadly to seek on fundamental questions, or when brought face to face with hitherto

dedication of the Temple with respect to the given covenant we might properly call a *Petition of Rights*.

unrecognized facts. Like common sense, the eighteenth century was superficial and jumped to conclusions, whereas no enduring work can be done without reflection and rigid inquiry. A book such as the *Origin of Species* would have been as absolutely impossible then in its whole thought and method as the writings of Voltaire would be in our own day. It was natural that controversy should be rife at such a time, for every one felt sure of his ground and able to justify it by argument. He knew that he was right and that you were wrong, and that he could prove it to demonstration. Nor was the atmosphere of Grub Street favourable to a high tone of discussion. So long as it was thought more or less disgraceful to earn one's living (and even Byron in his earlier days had to refute the calumny that he got anything by his works) there could not be expected the same courtesy to opponents as is displayed to-day. To all this it must be added that place-hunting was as common in Church as in State; that the Whig aristocracy had settled down upon both, in apparent security for all time[1]. They were sure of the best things both in this world and the next. We may remember how a great lady exclaimed to Lady Huntingdon against the notion that the high-born could be on terms of equality before God with the poor, a doctrine destructive of respect and dangerous to society. The clergy were doubtless less bad than they have been painted: at least a zeal for religion was not thought a sufficient plea for neglect to study what it means[2]. Still an excessive devotion to work has never been claimed for them, and a little later Miss Austen makes one of her characters

[1] Warburton not being of high birth was naturally indignant at this: "Reckon upon it that Durham goes to some noble ecclesiastic. 'Tis a morsel only for them. Our grandees have at last found their way back into the Church. I only wonder they have been so long about it. But be assured that nothing but a new religious revolution to sweep away the fragments that Harry the Eighth left after banqueting his courtiers will drive them out again": *Letters to Hurd* 119.

[2] Warburton's words are evidence of the general opinion: "Let a clergyman be once noted for his ignorance, and so strong is either the general malignity to his order, or the inforced sense men have of its inward dignity, that such a one is held up through life for the common object of contempt and derision": *Works* v. 590.

scout the notion of a clergyman ever *doing* anything, at least if he were a gentleman.

Of this world, self-satisfied, combative, artificial, so certain of the present that it neglected to understand the past or to presage the future, secure in political and ecclesiastical arrangements, on good terms with Dissenters but convinced of the iniquity of Popery, the insincerity of atheism, and the dangerous folly of Quakerism, Methodism and all other enthusiasm, loving controversy more than truth, and arguing for the immortality of the soul instead of preaching the redemption of the man, Warburton was an almost ideal embodiment, just because he was so very unideal and shared its weakness no less than its strength.

Born at Newark in 1698, after being articled to an attorney he was ordained in 1723 without ever residing at a University; although afterwards Cambridge gave him a degree in order to oblige his patron Sir Robert Sutton. His zeal for study was at all times very great, and he is reported to have curtailed both exercise and food that he might devote the more energy thereto. As he said in later years when his health was enfeebled, "You know by experience how difficult it is when we have once got into a wicked habit of *thinking* to leave it off. All I can promise is, if that will satisfy you, to *think to no purpose*"[1]. For many years he lived in Brant Broughton, the living to which his patron had presented him. In 1736 appeared *The Alliance between Church and State*, and in the next year the first three books of *The Divine Legation delivered to Moses*, to which the *Alliance* is really a subsidiary argument. Warburton had now taken the plunge into the controversial arena of the day, and only emerged from what was a drawn battle, with the decay of his powers, in 1770. He conducted his case, whatever it might be, with an ingenuity only equalled by his arrogance, and with a lack of taste and temper which is fortunately rarer now than it was then. The second part of the *Divine Legation* appeared in 1741. The last Book is a posthumous fragment. In 1738 he defended Pope's *Essay on Man* from the not unnatural charge of heterodoxy, and

[1] *Letters to Hurd* 437.

became henceforward the satirist's friend, and eventually his literary executor. The fourth book of the *Dunciad* is said to have been suggested by him. With Bolingbroke he came into personally hostile relations, which sharpened the point of his attack upon his writings [1], while the statesman replied with *A Familiar Epistle to the Most Impudent Man Living.* He edited Pope and put his enemies in the footnotes. In 1747 was published his edition of Shakespeare, said to be the worst ever produced. In 1750 he issued a work on Julian, designed to prove the miraculous nature of the causes which prevented the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. He had married in 1745 the niece of Ralph Allen of Prior Park, a man of wealth and political influence. This and his acquaintance with Lord Mansfield secured him first of all the Preachership of Lincoln's Inn, which appointment he disliked, as it necessitated the composition of sermons; then a prebendal stall at Gloucester, later one at Durham, against which he rails for the inordinate feasting at his installation. In 1757 the deanery of Bristol was given him by Pitt, and finally the bishopric of Gloucester. His chief friend after Pope and the Allens was Hurd, afterwards Bishop of Worcester. He shared the prevailing distrust of Wesley, and bitterly attacked him in the *Doctrine of Grace.* He appears to have taken some interest in his diocese, and attempted to raise the age for confirmation. After an accident in 1770 his health failed. He died in 1779.

Warburton was a man born to be hated and feared, who did not quarrel with his destiny. He seems to have been in love with unpopularity, regarding it as evidence of force of character and intellect [2]. He fought his way to the front with the weapons in vogue at the time, flattery and interest. He boasted of his rough manners, and probably took an artistic

[1] This is how he alludes to one of his controversies with Bolingbroke: "Overwhelmed, as it were, with the weight of so irresistible a power, after long wriggling to get free, he at length crawls forth; but so maimed and broken, so impotent and fretful, that all his remaining strength is in his venom": *Divine Legation* iv. 401.

[2] As he says in alluding to one of his adversaries: "The worst that has befallen me in the defence of Religion is only the railings of the vile and impotent; and the worst that is likely to befall him is only the ridicule of all the rest": *Divine Legation* iv. 312.

delight in rudeness. Doubtless his lack of courtesy to the world in general was the veil by which he strove to hide his dependence on the Allens. He died as he had lived, little loved beyond his immediate circle, but with a reputation as an intellectual giant, which has hardly been maintained. No one disputes his erudition, or trusts his opinion. As an apologist for Christianity he was not always taken seriously, and was by some thought not to have taken himself seriously. His style is commonly regarded as on a par with his taste. He is indeed rarely mentioned, save to point the moral of the degradation of religion in the eighteenth century, and is pictured as the typical example of the prelate of that period at his worst, selfish, ambitious, and unspiritual, with no sense of religion save as a topic for argument and no regard for the Church except as an avenue to preferment, and without even the saving grace of high birth and distinguished manners.

But I do not think that this judgement is quite fair. The more one studies his works, the more leniently one is disposed to judge their author. His faults indeed are so glaring that it would be waste of time to point them out. The real interest of such a character lies in the fact that he and his writings were the natural outcome of his time; by which I mean that his merits are those of his day, which was not so corrupt as we are apt to imagine; and that these merits were mingled with corresponding defects against which he could partly have guarded himself had he so chosen, but he did not choose. The use he makes of his erudition is sometimes merely frivolous. Despite his genuine faith and an honesty in some respects greater than that of his brethren, his advocacy strikes one as highly artificial, and seems too ingenious to be sincere. For he could not lose sight of himself in the greatness of his end or forget that he was arguing for a brief. Whether or no he was aware of his limitations, he seems to have made no effort to transcend them. But this is the fault of the great majority of men in any age, and need not be attributed to those of the eighteenth century merely because their limitations were different from ours.

The Alliance between Church and State is one of the most

characteristic products of that age, and is interesting as a phase in the growth of the theory of toleration. It is an attempt to *demonstrate the necessity of an established Religion with a Test Law on the fundamental principles of the Law of Nature and Nations*[1]. Such an attempt was needed. Religious uniformity had been the ideal until the Revolution. The Toleration Act abandoned this. At the same time the Church of England was left in a position of peculiar privilege, and the penal laws against Papists and the Test Acts remained for some time really, for a long while nominally, in force. Moreover, by the Act of Union with Scotland in 1707 an established religion had been recognized in one part of Great Britain, which was at variance with that of the other. So far men had gone. Others naturally went further and demanded the removal of all religious tests. Practically of course they were abrogated by the custom of passing annual indemnity Acts to save persons who had held public office without complying with the tests from the consequences of their omission. But Walpole steadily refused to secure their abolition, and it was thought by many desirable to have them as a safeguard (like many other laws), even though they were not habitually enforced. This state of things Warburton set himself to justify. In doing so, and he did it uncommonly well, he has left a monument of eighteenth-century thought, equal in historical and perhaps artistic value to one of the churches of that epoch. If we do not admire the structure, at any rate it helps us to comprehend the conditions which brought it into being. The eighteenth century was dominated in its political thought by legal ideas. Every one, or nearly every one, was

[1] It is not any particular establishment that Warburton defends, for he admits that the State has nothing to do with the enforcement of religious truth: his object is to justify the idea of an established Church and of excluding from political life those who do not conform to it, whatever it be; just as Hobbes and his followers denied the right of insurrection against any existing government. "Here, as before in the case of an Establishment, it is not to my purpose to defend this or that national form or mode . . . but a Test Law in general. By which I understand *some sufficient proof or evidence required from those admitted into the administration of public affairs, of their being members of the religion established by law.*" *The Alliance between Church and State*, fourth edition, London 1766, p. 283.

content to see the beginnings of civil society in an original compact, tacit or express, which was believed to be the only effectual security for individual liberty and the rights of conscience. The theory was as simple as it was unsound, and is familiar to all readers of Locke. Men existing in a state of Nature are all born free and equal. But violence and injustice arise. So they agree to form a society which is thus based on a contract. When the State or the government of the State oversteps the limits of this contract, i. e. attempts anything contrary to the ends of individual liberty and the security of property, the contract is *ipso facto* dissolved and resistance becomes lawful. This was the justification of the Revolution offered by the orthodox Whigs, and it served in a different form to support both the American Revolt and the French Revolution. The interest of Warburton's book is that he avowedly extends this principle to explain the relations between the State and the Church, i. e. to justify (1) a toleration perfect in theory but limited in practice, (2) an established Church, (3) a stringent test-law to buttress the latter. Warburton repudiates in the strongest terms the notion of persecution. Religion is concerned with truth. Belief does not depend upon an act of the will. Coercion is therefore impossible and unjustifiable. The State is concerned with temporal goods alone, and the Church as such has nothing to do with these. Unless therefore one or the other oversteps its limits there is neither occasion for conflict nor excuse for persecution. Hobbeism and Popery are equally false. For each view regards the State as though its aim were to enforce truth, whereas utility and peace are its sole legitimate objects[1]. Still there are exceptions. The paramount end of the State being civil peace, there may be occasions when certain opinions are antagonistic to this. Upon such occasions the repression of opinions by the State,

[1] "But this however is worthy our observation, that, as different ways as the Hobbeist and Papist look, in speculation, they tend to the same point in practice. For tho' the *one* would have the magistrate discharge his office only as executioner of the Church; and the *other* authorizes him to use his power as the maker and creator of it; yet they equally concur in teaching it to be his right and office to domineer over conscience. What they differ in, is only a point of ceremony": *Alliance* 66.

or rather of their expression, is permissible. Further, there is a *sine qua non* for the very existence of the State, not in any form of religion, but in theism itself. In this, as in most of his argument about toleration, Warburton follows Locke, and is akin to Rousseau, who would tolerate no atheist. The argument is as follows. Civil society is founded *ex hypothesi* on a compact. But how is this compact rendered binding? Not by law, for it is anterior to law. By an oath. Thus the objections of the opponents of the doctrine of contract who asked what made a fundamental law obligatory were answered. But an oath presupposes belief in God, as a rewarder of men's actions, and in the moral law as the expression of His will. Thus then theism is necessary for the existence of the State, which cannot therefore harbour atheists, since their views would upset it from the foundation[1]. But this is a purely political motive. In itself opinion is free, and no one has any right to prohibit any form of theistic belief, as such.

So much for belief. We now come to the question of organization. Religion is not only inward but outward. It cannot be taught as a mere divine philosophy in the mind. Quakerism is impossible on a large scale, and an interesting passage shows how William Penn himself found it necessary to devise not merely a governing society, but a test law. Religion organizes itself into a society, and as such must perforce come into relations with that other society known as the State. Neither society is subordinate to the other of its own nature. The Church comes from God, or professes so to do, and must be sovereign and independent in view of its end. So with the State, whose end, as we have seen, is different but equally needful to man. But two societies, each sovereign

[1] "The entrance into society was by convention and stipulation. But then again that same equality which made every man's consent necessary, prevented his giving any other security for the performance of his compact than his mere word: and how feeble a security that is, all men know. Some means therefore were to be contrived to strengthen the obligation of his word. Now nothing in the case here imagined of perfect equality (and such was the real case on men's entering into society) could give this strength, but religion": *Alliance* 36.

and independent, of which the end of one is peace and the other truth, are liable to come into collision in practice; for the distinctness of their aims may easily be forgotten, and there is no security that one will not strive to usurp the functions of the other. This is the more likely, as neither can do without the help of its neighbour. The State needs the assistance of the Church in order to enforce obedience as a duty binding upon the conscience, and also to secure the performance of certain duties (such as social purity), which it would be inexpedient to make legally obligatory. The Church, of itself defenceless (as such it has no power over outward things), needs the protection of the State, that it may worship unmolested and enjoy such outward goods as are needful to its efficiency. The two societies therefore agree to an alliance on the following terms [1]. In return for protection the Church surrenders its independence. In return for political utility the State establishes *the religion of the majority of the people, whatever it be.* For the State not being concerned with truth, but utility, naturally finds the services of the most influential religious society of the greatest value. The supremacy of the State is a necessary condition of the alliance, otherwise doctrines might be changed so as to prejudice the State, or a course of action adopted incompatible with the very objects for which the State entered into the compact. On the other hand, the Church secures endowments, which it would surrender if disestablished, for they are given to it solely in order to the performance of certain public services. Tithe is not obligatory on Christians, although divine sanction was given to it in the

[1] "Having found that each Society is sovereign, and independent on the other, it as necessarily follows, that such Union can be produced only by free convention and mutual compact: because whatever is sovereign and independent, can be brought to no act without its own consent: but nothing can give birth to a free convention but a sense of mutual wants which may be supplied, or a view of mutual benefits that may be gained by it. Such, then, is the nature of that Union which produceth a Church by Law established; and which is indeed no other than a politic league and alliance for mutual support and defence. For the State not having the care of souls, cannot, of itself, inforce the influence of religion; and therefore seeks aid of the Church: and the Church having no coercive power (the consequence of its care not extending to bodies), as naturally flies for protection to the State": *Alliance* 85.

"Horeb contract" for the unique case of the Jewish theocracy. The Church further secures the right of being represented in the governing assembly and of excluding from all public office those who do not conform to it. A test law is thus of the essence of the contract. Otherwise the Church might lose the very protection in return for which it surrendered its liberty, if political power were given to members of other religious bodies each of which desires to rise on the ruins of the rest. Nor is this unjust to Nonconformists. For the original compact is one entered into for protection of liberty and property, the only natural rights, and no man has any natural right to office or power. The union is a "federated alliance, not an incorporation of the Church by the State"[1]. Thus in theory

[1] "Let us see next, what privileges, through the concession of the Church, the State gained by it. These in a word, may be comprised in its supremacy in matters ecclesiastical. The Church resigning up her independency, and making the magistrate her supreme head, without whose approbation and allowance she can administer, transact, or decree nothing. For the State, by this alliance, having undertaken the protection of the Church; and protection not being to be afforded to any community without power over it, in the community protecting; it necessarily follows, that the Civil magistrate must be supreme. Protection is a kind of guardianship; and guardianship, in its very nature, implies superiority and rule. The charge therefore of protection without a right of supremacy, is giving the State no better an office than that of public executioner of the decrees of the Church. In which high station we find those States to be advanced that are most enslaved to the Papal power. But further, when the State, by this convention, covenanted to afford the Church protection, that contract was made with a particular Church of one denomination, and of such determined doctrine and discipline. But now that protection, which might be advantageous to a State in union with such a Church, might be disadvantageous to it in union with one of a different doctrine and discipline: therefore, when protection is given to a Church, it must be at the same time provided, that no alteration be made in it, without the approbation and allowance of the State": *Alliance* 181.

"Now tho' by this alliance of Church and State, no new regulations can be made for Church government, but by the State's authority; yet still there is reason that the Church should be previously consulted, which we must suppose well skilled (as in her proper business) to form and digest such new regulations, before they come before the consideration of the Civil Legislature. Acting otherwise is changing this, which is a *federate alliance*, into an *incorporate union*; where, indeed, the practice is different: for in an incorporate union of two Societies, one of them is lost and dissolved in the other; by which means, all the power in question devolves upon the survivor. But in a *federate alliance*, the two societies still subsist intire; tho' in a subordination of one to the other: in which case, it seems agreeable to natural equity that

at least the Church preserves its synods and assemblies, though these latter must of course be held subject to civil sanction. But the Church has no courts existing on its own authority, for religion has nothing to do with coercion. But it of course has the right to excommunicate those who do not conform to its doctrines, for this is of the essence of all religious bodies. Further, it gains from the State the power to punish by coercive means certain moral offences, which the civil law finds it inconvenient to repress directly. Finally, the author argues that this federated alliance is possible, even where both Church and State be composed of identically the same persons. The two are bodies incorporate with different ends, and each has a real will and a real personality of its own distinct from that of any one or the sum of its members. This opinion is interesting in view of recent developments of *Genossenschaftrecht*. It is strange indeed that Dr Gierke and Professor Maitland should have their counterpart in a latitudinarian ecclesiastic, writing at a time when political and theological thought was essentially atomistic; yet it can hardly be denied that Warburton was what they would have called a "realist," even if the realism be imperfect[1].

Such in brief is the logical system which mirrored the

no alterations in Church government be made without the joint consent of both": *Alliance* 193.

[1] "That two such Societies have two distinct *Wills* and *Personalities* I shall show. When any number of men form themselves into a Society, whether Civil or Religious, this Society becomes a *Body* different from that aggregate which the number of individuals composed before the Society was formed. Else the Society would be nothing; or, in other words, no Society would be formed. Here then is a *Body* distinct from the aggregate composed by the number of individuals; and is called *factitious* to distinguish it from the *natural Body*; being, indeed, the *Creature of human Will*. But a *Body* must have its *proper Personality and Will*, which, without these, is no more than a shadow or a name. This Personality and Will are neither the Personality and Will of one individual, nor of all together. Not of one is self-evident. Not of *all*, because the majority, in this *factitious body*, hath the denomination of the *person* and of the *will* of the society. We conclude then, that the *Will* and *Personality* of a Community are as different and distinct from the Will and Personality of the numbers of which it is composed, as the *Body* itself is. And, that as in the erection of a Community, a *factitious Body* was created, so were a *factitious Personality and Will*. The reality of this *Personality* is clearly seen in the Administration of the *Law of Nations* where two States are, considered as two Men living in the State of Nature": *Alliance* 264.

politico-ecclesiastical machinery of Warburton's time. Can it be denied that it is ingenious? Tinged, as is all his writing, with the colour of contemporary thought, it shares its prevailing defects. The theory is artificial and unhistorical. It might seem, as the author admits, merely a sweeping generalization from the spectacle of the existing English constitution, instead of what it professed to be, a deduction from universal principles[1]. But ancient and modern political theorists have shared the same criticism. Nearly every system which professes to be deduced from general philosophical principles will be found on investigation to bear a very close relation to the facts of some existing government. Hegel was accused of using his whole philosophy to discover the Idea incarnate in the Prussian despotism. In fact the most theoretical of political theorists always has and ought to have a practical end, and the end is naturally determined by the conditions of the world, as he finds it or wishes it to become. There is no need to blame Warburton, because the parturition of the mountains in the shape of the search for universal principles has resulted in nothing better than a moth-eaten "Case for Establishment." As an Englishman's Brief it might bear comparison with one evoked by a different political situation.

Instead then of making this obvious criticism, let us see whether there be not some kernel of wisdom beneath the husk of obsolete dialectic and unhistorical description. In the first place, Warburton recognizes one great truth which modern sentimentalism is apt to ignore. He sees that to the State public utility is the paramount end, and that it always punishes offences as crimes, i.e. as dangerous to itself, never as sins, i.e. as wrong in themselves or harmful to the individual. A great deal of loose thinking nowadays might be saved, if we could bear in mind that it is the business of no State to enforce morality as such, i.e. to take cognizance of acts apart

[1] "In England alone the original terms of this Convention are kept up to so exactly, that this account of the *Alliance between Church and State* seems rather a copy of the Church and State of *England*, than a theory, as indeed it was, formed solely on the contemplation of Nature, and the unvariable reason of things: which had no further regard to our particular Establishment, than as some part of it tended to illustrate these abstract reasonings": *Alliance* 204.

from their effects upon the social group. There may be many matters social and economic in which it may be well for the State to interfere in order to secure either the health or the wealth or the education of its members, all of them ends of public importance. But it is unjustifiable to base any such claim to interference on the ground that the acts forbidden are selfish or avaricious or unsympathetic in themselves. An attempt to enforce any system of morality, as such, on those who do not admit its sanctions is of the nature of persecution. Nor can we get over the crux by saying that the character of the State is the character of the individuals who compose it, without in the long run so effecting the absorption of the unit in the mass as to demoralize both. Warburton's clear recognition of the personality of the social group, as something distinct from the aggregate of its members, seems to have prevented him allowing too great a scope either to individual liberty or to State action. The great problem of all societies has been to reconcile the limits of the two. It cannot be said to have ever been solved. But a recognition of the reality and separateness of the individual on the one hand, and the group on the other (however much the individual owes to the group), would seem to be the necessary condition of a right judgement in the matter. If we treat the one as an end apart entirely from the other, we shall, according as we desire the individual or the society, arrive at either an impossible anarchism or an almost equally impossible socialism. And since these problems are at their acutest in the sphere of religion, we find the one extreme making religion what Warburton calls merely a divine philosophy in the mind, and making individual caprice the sole criterion of truth (illustrated perhaps best by Quakerism in the days when it was freest from organization), while the other extreme destroys the individual conscience and intellect in the service of the group. This latter is best illustrated in theory by the writings of Machiavelli, and in practice by the Society of Jesus, which makes the soul an instrument, *quasi cadaver*, in the hands of the group.

A second truth perceived by Warburton is this. He realized that it is nonsense to talk of establishment, as though it

were a one-sided arrangement by which the Church was to be the only gainer. The time was past for regarding the legal position of the Church as imposed by her upon the State without any *quid pro quo*. However she obtained it, it was idle to deny that the Church was in a position of peculiar privilege at the moment, and equally idle to expect that this could be maintained unless the State possessed over it a greater measure of control than that claimed over other religious bodies. Nor is it fair to accuse Warburton of Erastianism. He distinctly asserts that the Church is inherently free and only surrenders her independence in return for certain advantages secured by contract. And on the analogy of the original contract, if the State violates the bargain, the alliance is dissolved and the exercise of her independent sovereignty reverts to the Church. Now according to Warburton's theory such a dissolution took place long ago. In his view the repeal of all religious tests was a breach of the contract, and hence so far from branding him as an Erastian those persons who oppose the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee and the Court of Arches would be better employed in using his arguments to strengthen the plausibility of their case[1]. I do not say that Warburton could really have approved of these instances of resistance to the Courts, or that the essential elements of his theory require it, but it is certain that in his view the tests were of the very essence of the contract and that it therefore would dissolve at their abolition. Lastly, it is this view about the tests, coupled with his evidently sincere belief in toleration, that makes his book an interesting phase in the history of toleration. It was a view held by the great Lord Halifax, who was willing to consent to the repeal of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics but not to the abolition of the tests. Warburton indeed did not go so far. He regarded Popery as a permanent political danger by

[1] His succinct description of the different views on the subject is worth quoting :—"The Papist makes the State a creature of the Church; the Erastian makes the Church a creature of the State: the Presbyterian would regulate the State on Church ideas; the Hobbeist, the Church on reasons of State; and to complete the farce, the Quaker abolishes the very being of a Church; and the Mennonite suppresses the office of the civil magistrate": *Alliance* 28.

its admitted principles antagonistic to the State, and on that ground, like Locke, he would not have tolerated it. We may say that toleration entered its first phase when Elizabeth declared that her only quarrel with those she persecuted was a political one, and that she did not desire to interfere with belief. This gives up the notion that the State has to do with the individual conscience as such. And since that time we have been slowly working out the consequences of this view, which have by no means yet exhausted themselves. Indeed they are among the causes of the diminishing Church attendance of the day, which is less of an evil than is apt to be supposed. Warburton's stage is that of the apologist of an establishment which had only just surrendered the claim to be the only recognized religious body in the country. He is midway between Hooker and John Stuart Mill. In his recognition of the claims of the individual conscience he may be classed with the latter; in his desire to make the Church conterminous with the politically active part of the nation he ranks with the former. But he has given up the notion of excluding from the national life those who do not conform to the established religion. He sees, that since the same parliament recognizes two different established Churches, the cause must be sought not in the interest of the State in the beliefs of its members, but in the aim of securing the public support of the most influential body within it. Thus it is not the truth of the opinions inculcated, but public utility, that is the real justification of a national establishment[1]. With such recognition as this of the incompetence of the temporal power to

[1] He regards this error as the cause at once of the failure of other apologists to justify an establishment, and of the apparent success of the opponents of a test law:

"The defenders of an *Established Religion* have all along gone on to support it on the Motives of Truth, and not of Utility. That is, that Religion was to be *established* and protected as it was the true Religion; not for the sake of its civil utility, which is the great principle of this theory": *Alliance* 340.

"The best writers on the other side took this mistaken principle for granted; imagining there could be no other possible cause assigned for established religion; and at the same time, finding this full both of absurdity and mischief, too hastily concluded an *established religion* secured by a *test law* to be a violation of the rights of Nature and Nations": *Alliance* 341.

enter into matters of belief, and its indifference to them proved by the same power supporting two different establishments, further developments of toleration were inevitable, and it was not likely that Warburton would find successors in that art of dancing on a logical tight-rope which he performed with such agility, as to be able to give a very plausible dialectical defence of a situation that bristled with anomalies. Only it must not be forgotten that there was truth in his final proviso. The end of the State being peace and utility, there is always the abstract possibility of it being advisable in the interests of peace to repress the publication of certain opinions. However much we talk of the individual's right "to speak the thing he will," we ought not to forget this contingency. Warburton with the emphatic phrase of his time goes too far in his admission and uses language which would justify a great deal of persecution, and approaches more nearly to Hobbes in this respect. But it is an admission which must theoretically be made[1].

Having thus established himself in the serene conviction that an established religion with a test law is the universal voice of nature—"The most savage nations have employed it to civilize their manners, and the politest know no other way to prevent their return to barbarity and violence"—Warburton set himself to the task of using his theory in his larger if not

[1] "Again, if God destined Man to two such states of existence, in each of which the happiness of the existing state was to be his end, it is demonstrable, and almost self-evident, that he, at the same time, so disposed things, that the means of attaining the happiness of one state should not cross or obstruct the means of attaining the happiness of the other. From whence we must conclude, that where the supposed means of each, namely, *Opinions* and *Civil Peace*, do clash, there *one* of them is *not the true means* of happiness. But the means of attaining the happiness peculiar to that state in which the man at present exists, being perfectly and infallibly known to man; and the means of the happiness of his future existence, as far as relates to the discovery of unrevealed Truth, but very imperfectly known by him; it necessarily follows, that wherever opinions clash with Civil Peace, those opinions are no means of future happiness: or, in other words, are either no Truths or Truths of no importance": *Alliance* 316. Even this might be admitted, if we strike out the words perfectly and infallibly, and take "clash" literally and not merely (as would assuredly be the case in practice) as equivalent to "are thought to clash." Christianity did not clash with the peace of the Roman Empire, but it was thought to do so.

greater work *The Divine Legation of Moses.* His object was to turn the flank of the infidel attack by admitting the absence of the doctrine of immortality from the Mosaic dispensation, and using such absence as a proof of the unique and Divine character of the Jewish religion. The argument is that the part played in the religion of all other nations by the belief in a future system of rewards and punishments, was in the case of the Jews performed by the extraordinary Providence, which by annexing temporal blessings to right-doing dispensed with the need of securing poetic justice in a future life [1]. The theory is that God was the direct governor of the Jews and inculcated the moral law by immediate temporal sanctions; of other nations living under an "ordinary" dispensation God was only the remote sovereign with the doctrine of a future life for the sole sanction of His laws. In the author's own words his argument is as follows:

"If Religion be necessary to civil government and if Religion cannot subsist under the common dispensation of Providence, without a future state of rewards and punishments, so consummate a lawgiver would never have neglected to inculcate the belief of such a state had he not been well assured that an *extraordinary providence* was indeed to be administered over his people: or were it possible he had been so infatuated, the impotency of a religion wanting a future state must very soon have concluded in the destruction of his republic: yet nevertheless it flourished and continued sovereign for many ages.

These two proofs of the proposition (that an extraordinary providence was really administered) drawn from the thing omitted and the person omitting may be reduced to the following syllogisms:

I. Whatsoever Religion and Society have no future state

[1] "Under a *common and unequal* Providence Religion cannot subsist without the doctrine of a future state: for religion implying a just retribution of reward and punishment, which under such a Providence is not dispensed, a future state must needs subvene, to prevent the whole edifice from falling into ruin . . . But where an extraordinary Providence is administered, good and evil are exactly distributed; and therefore in this circumstance a future state is not necessary for the support of Religion. It is not to be found in the Mosaic economy; yet this economy subsisted for many ages; Religion therefore did not need it, or in other words, it was supported by an *Extraordinary Providence*": *Divine Legation* iv. 391.

for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary providence.

The Jewish Religion and Society had no future state for their support:

Therefore the Jewish Religion and Society were supported by an extraordinary providence.

II. The ancient law-givers universally believed that a religion without a future state could be supported only by an extraordinary providence.

Moses, an ancient law-giver learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (the principal branch of which wisdom was inculcating the doctrine of a future state), instituted such a religion:

Therefore Moses believed that his religion was supported by an extraordinary providence.

This is the argument of the Divine Legation, plain, simple, and convincing in the opinion of the author; a paradox, in the representation of his adversaries; attempts of this nature being still attended with the fortune they have long undergone"[1].

The position was, as the author allows, an audacious paradox. But at least it was a very ingenious one, and it is supported by a variety of arguments that make the book a treasure of inaccurate information and brilliant sophistry. The book is a sort of encyclopaedia of learning and criticism, mostly erroneous. But Warburton's contention that it all has a distinct bearing on the main argument is fairly made out. The author anticipated and endeavoured to meet the charge of discursiveness. As he says, "The deep Professor who hath digested his Theology into Summs and Systems and the florid Preacher who never suffered his thoughts to expatiate beyond the limits of a pulpit-essay will be ready to tell me that I had promised to demonstrate the Divine Legation of Moses; and that, now I had written two large volumes on that subject, all that they could find in them were discourses on the foundation of morality—the origin of civil and religious Society—the alliance between Church and State—the policy of Law-givers—the mysteries of the Priests and the opinions of the Greek philosophers—the antiquity of Egypt—their hieroglyphics—their heroes—and their Brute-worship. That indeed at last

[1] *Divine Legation* v. 364, 365.

I speak a little of the Jewish policy; but I soon break away from it, as from a subject I would avoid, and employ the remaining part of the volume on the sacrifice of Isaac—on the book of Job—and on primary and secondary prophecies"[1].

We have in fact as subsidiary to the main thread an attempt at a politico-ecclesiastical philosophy, an inquiry into Greek thought, an investigation of comparative religion forming a sort of "Golden Bough" for that period, a bit of the higher criticism, a treatise on the origin of language, and a whole philosophy of history all rolled into one. The theory set forth about the book of Job is so interesting, that however unsupported by evidence, it is worth mentioning. The book of Job is from the pen of Ezra, and is an endeavour to solve the problem that arose during the Jewish captivity, when owing to the Israelites having violated "the Horeb contract," the extraordinary providence had been withdrawn, and temporal blessings were no longer the invariable reward of good conduct. Job thus represents the Jewish people, and his three friends in the allegory personate the false sympathy of Sanballat and his fellows. His wife is the typical heathen woman whom the Jews were reproached for marrying. Elihu is the incarnation of the prophetic spirit, while Satan plays his part in order to show the falsity of dualism and to prove that evil spirits no less than good are the creatures of God and subject to His sovereignty. No one can question the ingenuity or the superficial plausibility of this interpretation. It is a good instance of Warburton's audacity and freedom from traditional prejudice. But it is likewise evidence of the uncritical recklessness with which he adopted any notion that occurred to him and snatched at every hypothesis that might bolster up his case, careless of the real validity of the argument[2].

[1] *Divine Legation* v. 359.

[2] Warburton's description of the different attempts to interpret the book is a good example of his taste and humour:

"Poor Job! It was his eternal fate to be persecuted by his friends. His three comforters passed sentence of condemnation upon him, and he has been executing *in effigie* ever since. He was first bound to the stake by a long catena of Greek Fathers; then tortured by Pineda; then strangled by Caryl, and afterwards cut up by Wesley, and anatomized by Garnet. Pray don't reckon me amongst his hangmen. I only acted the tender part of his wife,

The defect of this theory is the defect of the whole book. Despite its portentous length (and we only have a little more than two-thirds of what the author originally intended) the *Divine Legation* bears all the impress of haste in the writing. It seems as though a brief had been accepted without due consideration, and the case had been got up in a hurry by a mind that, in spite of its impatience, was able to lavish upon it a profusion of learning and a wealth of argument fitter to dazzle the reader than persuade him. Paradox is supported by paradox, hypothesis heaped upon hypothesis, and erudition piled upon abuse by an author too vain of his prodigious knowledge to trouble about its sifting, and too anxious to exhibit his skill as a gladiator to care in what cause or with what weapons he fights. There are plenty of inquiries, but no real investigation; much reasoning, but no science. The whole book gives us an impression of the most sagacious and largest of quadrupeds trying to support himself on a tortoise which has broken its back. I cannot help thinking that Mr Leslie Stephen's judgement of Warburton errs upon the side of excessive severity; but it is impossible, when perusing the *Divine Legation*, not to see the justice of the gibe, "There is one God and Warburton is his attorney-general." It is a work in which the idea of God never rises above that of a statesman and sometimes falls below that of a diplomat.

But the book is not always insincere, even in its most unsatisfactory parts. Warburton was probably quite honest in the virulent attack he makes on ancient thinkers, for his was a mind incapable of understanding any philosophy[1]. Otherwise it would be strange to find a writer imbued, as he is, with the sense that ancient history is the preparation for Christ, as strongly convinced of the futility of heathen thought as a Puritan could be of the vanity of carnal learning.

But there are real merits in the book. It is, as its author claims, a harmoniously articulated whole, not a mere farrago

and was for making short work with him. But he was ordained, I think, by a fate like that of Prometheus, to lie still upon his dunghill and have his brains sucked out by owls." *Letters to Hurd* 29, 30.

[1] Of one great system he finds a sufficient refutation in the words "the infamous Spinoza." *Divine Legation* iv. 273.

of discussions, and in this way (to those who take the trouble to trace the bearing of each section on the general plan) it may even come to possess a certain artistic quality. This is hardly the case with the somewhat bludgeon-like style. But it has at least the merit of clearness; whether Warburton always knew what he thought is doubtful, but he certainly knew what he meant to say, and said it. Then in one respect the book is remarkably honest. Warburton saw the somewhat paltry shifts to which apologists were put in their efforts to maintain that the doctrine of immortality was at all times familiar to the Jews. He saw that the arguments would not hold water, and that the plain facts were against the orthodox view. It would be more honest to admit this, and he did so. But he felt convinced that the Christian religion was not in danger in consequence of this surrender, and thought that, so far from a drawback, the very admission might be made into a fresh source of dialectical triumph. His method was a little sweeping, but it was certainly original, and showed that the author's courage in making use of what seemed a concession was equal to his honesty in granting it. But it had one advantage. By laying stress upon the difference in so fundamental an article of the Jewish creed from the Christian it served to foster the notion of a progressive illumination. Thus in an unhistorical age the *Divine Legation* shows us the first glimpse of the historical spirit, and of the belief in the Divine Immanence in human history[1]. Warburton did to a certain extent consciously recognize the gradual evolution of religious ideas, although the recognition of the truth is so implicated with dull discussions or obsolete theories that it is no wonder he has not the credit of it. But the fact comes out both in the attempt to derive early Egyptian religion from ancestor-worship, and also in his admission that as time went on the doctrine of a future life was held by many of the Jews; the notion being that, as the extraordinary providence had abandoned the Israelite nation

[1] "The Holy Spirit quite throughout God's grand economy, from His first giving of the Law to the completion of it by the Gospel, observed the same unvaried method of the gradual communication of Truth": *Divine Legation* v. 356.

as a penalty for their breaches of the contract, they were now under an ordinary providence gradually prepared for the coming of Christ[1]. The whole book indeed is evidence that Warburton had some dim recognition of the truth that (whatever we hold of his nature) the life of Jesus forms the central point of the history of mankind. To him, as to all Christians who reflect on the matter, the Incarnation is the only adequate philosophy of history. The same fact comes out in the short work on Julian, and in the stress therein laid on the significance of the downfall of Judaism as a regular political organization.

In addition to this merit of having possessed some portion of the historical spirit, Warburton has that of understanding the true significance of "election." He sees that it means a call to special work and is not a capricious bestowal of privilege. The Jews in his view were not a most favoured nation, but a people separated by God from others in order to keep alive the truth of monotheism until the Messiah should appear to reveal its import[2].

[1] "To all this I hope the reader will not be so inattentive to object, 'that what is here produced from the New Testament to prove that the followers of the Law had no future state contradicts what I have more than once observed, that the later Jewish prophets had given strong intimations of an approaching dispensation with a future state.' For the question is concerning a future state's being the sanction of the Law, not of later intimations, of its being ready to become the sanction of the Gospel": *Divine Legation* iv. 372.

[2] Warburton regards this notion as merely a piece of conceit on the part of the Jews: "Enthusiasm is that temper of mind in which the imagination has got the better of the judgement. In this disordered state of things, enthusiasm when it happens to be turned upon religious matters becomes fanaticism: and this in its extreme begets the fancy of our being the peculiar favourites of Heaven": ibid. iv. 421.

"The truth indeed is, that the great principal and end of the Jewish Theocracy was to keep that people a separate nation under their own law and religion, till the coming of the Messiah; and to prepare things for His reception by preserving amongst them the doctrine of the Unity. Now to judge whether the Theocracy or extraordinary providence effected its end, we have only to consider, whether this people to the coming of Christ did continue a distinct nation separated from all the other tribes of mankind, and distinguished from them by the worship of the one true God. And on enquiry we shall find they not only did continue thus distinct and distinguished, but have so continued ever since. A circumstance which having no example amongst any other people is sufficient to convince us that there must have been some

These are large deductions to be taken from that indiscriminate condemnation which has been the meed of this extraordinary work. And deductions no less large must be taken from the common judgement of its author. William Warburton has an ill reputation. He is probably the least attractive of any subject in this course of lectures, and those who know little of him but his name know that it is not one of honour. The *Alliance* was instanced by Newman, as the best illustration of worldly Erastianism, the fitting shrine of the degraded ideals in Church and State, that were the product of the Whig domination. Warburton stands the representative of force without sympathy. He is a standing instance of the temerity of achievement possible to a great intellect undisciplined by love, and to a facility in dialectic which vanity too often directed into meaningless paradox. The curse of an ever conscious cleverness was upon him. At his best he is a brilliant controversialist, deficient in the highest sincerity and in the sense that patience and humility are needful guides in that hardest of all climbs

> "The mountain tops
> Where is the throne of truth."

But "truth is the cry of all and the game of a few" was the utterance of a great contemporary of Warburton, and the greatest religious controversialist of the nineteenth century was fain to put the query "what controversialist is not unfair?" And if despite this admission we can still own our debt to the genius of the latter writer, who was often the best illustration of the truth of his own maxim, the recognition of the fact should mitigate our judgement of Warburton. As Berkeley saw, the passion for truth is a rare quality in any generation, so rare indeed that it is almost ludicrous to blame a man for being deficient in a virtue which nine persons out of every ten do not even admire. Yet without this passion the greatest gifts—and Warburton's gifts were great—when employed on intellectual themes are apt to prove futile, in the same way as great talents in practical life will be of no service to one

amazing power in that Theocracy which could go on operating for so many ages after the extraordinary administration of it had ceased": *Divine Legation* iv. 426, 427.

without stability of purpose. Had Warburton taken more pains with himself he had the makings of an eighteenth-century Thirlwall, a man who was admired as much as Warburton was hated. And that gifts greater than Warburton's, or even Thirlwall's, rapidity and depth of thought, delight in paradox, contempt for the artificial and the petty, and distrust of emotion as a guide, may be disciplined into a character, which shall win love as well as admiration, has been proved by an instance too recent and too familiar to need more than mention [1]. Yet if we regret that Warburton's talents were employed rather to dazzle than to win enduring influence, we must not forbear to recognize how great those talents were. At least he had the qualities of his defects. His force and vigour have struck even those who admire him least. He had a good deal of insight into some prevailing evils, and a power of wit and sarcasm, which are probably unrecognized, because he is abused a great deal more than he is read. To him is attributed the maxim "orthodoxy is my doxy, heterdoxy is your doxy." His remarks on the poverty of the parochial clergy are pertinent to-day, "I agree with you as to the state of the inferior clergy. The Church enriched them, and forbade them to marry. The State impoverished them, and gave them wives to complete the kindness" [2]. His definition of a Protestant ought to commend him to certain modern partisans. "A sovereign contempt for the authority of the Fathers and no great reverence for any other is what nowadays constitutes a Protestant in fashion" [3]. But perhaps the most humorous of all his epigrams is this: "This might be heresy in an English bishop, but in an Irish 'tis only a blunder" [4]. As a rule, however, his most pithy remarks are disfigured by bad taste, or at least ill nature. "The common definition of man is false; he is not a reasoning animal. The best you can predicate of him is that he is an animal capable of reason, and this too we take upon an old

[1] Bishop Creighton died on Jan. 14, 1901: this lecture was delivered on April 23 following.—Ed.

[2] *Letters to Hurd* 403.

[3] Introduction to *Julian*: *Works* iv. 335.

[4] *Letters to Hurd* 92.

tradition." Or to take another example: "What is it to truth for instance what a courtier judges of a Church; a politician of conscience; or a Geometer, grown gray in Demonstration, of moral evidence?"[1] Many more terse and humorous sayings may be found in his writings by the curious[2]. But it would be strange, if among so much chaff we did not find some scattered grains of wheat. The merits of Warburton are greater and more real than the utterance of a few incisive epigrams. He had a certain robustness and common sense, which were the *cachet* of his age. And withal he was never stupid. His arguments may be sometimes sophistical, and his theories fanciful and far-fetched, but they are at least original, the product of an active intelligence. His promise "to think to no purpose" was truer to fact than he supposed, but it is also true that he was always thinking in the sense that his intellectual faculties were never dormant. Thus while his notions are sometimes silly and it is difficult to master some of his special pleading without irritation, his writing is never at bottom dull or quite barren. For he is always alert, and the elasticity of his intelligence renders his advocacy a really remarkable exhibition of intellectual gymnastic. Without being a profound thinker or in the ordinary sense a brilliant writer, Warburton is never fundamentally commonplace.

He was a born Ishmaelite, and however little we may trust or like him, his works are food for unceasing wonder, and in more respects than that of size deserve the epithet—Prodigious!

[1] *Divine Legation* iv. 286.

[2] As these are not likely to be numerous, I quote one or two more here. Toland he describes as a man "who made it the study of a wretched life to shed his venom on everything that was great and respectable." Ibid. i. part 2. p. 99. "Men are never so fond of moralizing as when they are ill at ease": *Letters to Hurd* 279.

A story he tells of himself illustrates his ponderous method as well as his satirical power. "One chanced to say he heard the King was not well. 'Hush,' said Colonel Robinson, 'it is not polite or decent to talk in this manner, the King is always well and in health; you are never to suppose that the diseases of his subjects ever approach his Royal person.' 'I perceive then, Colonel,' replied I, 'there is some difference between your Master and mine. Mine was subject to all human infirmities, sin excepted; yours is subject to none, sin excepted'": *Letters to Hurd* 319.

All puzzles are amusing, and Warburton is a perpetual puzzle; for the moment after we are sure of his sincerity we turn the page and become convinced of the contrary; and just when we have pronounced him intolerable, some freshness of argument or vivid phrase comes to delight or at least to interest the reader. He is at once inconceivably tiresome and astonishingly entertaining—tiresome because he wastes reams of paper in demonstrating an absurdity, entertaining because the demonstration is so ingenious and the absurdity embraced with such apparent conviction. I can say for myself, that at one time I have been so bored with his books that I wondered how I could possibly read them, and at others so interested that I blessed the fortune which brought them across my path. And he is futile, if we look only at permanent outcome; it is the process by which he reaches a result which is worthless that makes it possible to follow him with attention. The fact is that any real exercise of a man's intellectual faculties gives one a certain pleasure to witness. And then there is besides, as I said at the beginning, the whole ἦθος with which his writing is imbued. His love of paradox was a counterpart to his delight in controversy. It pleased him to play the part of *Athanasius contra mundum*, when there was no risk in the performance. And, like all lovers of paradox, he was irritated by popular commonplaces, and able to see neglected aspects of things. The real essence of the *Divine Legation* is the perception that the rudimentary creed of the Israelites was a fact that no special pleading could disprove, and that, so far from being an argument against Christianity, it was in reality one in its favour—since it pointed to the gradual process of the Divine education of the race, which was not only a reasonable but an essentially Christian view, and is implied in the whole notion of a preparatory Dispensation. This was true enough, and was apparent neither to the orthodox apologist nor to his infidel opponent. Of course Warburton must needs overstate his case, and put the truth in a form which was not merely paradoxical but immoral. But I do not think it can be denied that he did see more of the truth in this matter than the other combatants, and it must

be borne in mind that in every age the man who refuses to worship the idols of the market-place is regarded as not merely paradoxical but insincere. It takes a good deal to convince men that you are honest, if you see further than they do. The real offence of Warburton is that some of his paradoxes are due not to the fact of seeing more than others, but to the desire of speaking differently. Quick as he was and knew himself to be at detecting sophistry in others, he was either not quick or not honest enough to observe its traces in himself; and was careless of the truth of his utterances, provided only he could ensure their superficial originality. It has been said that all genuine thought is original, whether or no it results in new maxims. Those who make the mistake of confusing what is new with what is original can only end in the cult of eccentricity or the pursuit of merely verbal ingenuity and logical monstrosities. Such was the fate of Warburton.

To turn to another side of his character, one in which he shared to the full the prejudices of his time, his dislike of enthusiasm. The eighteenth century has suffered many things for its abhorrence of extravagance, and it is generally taken for granted that its views in this matter were the product of selfishness and stupidity. But now that Dr Nordau has arraigned its successor for its "Gospel of Intensity," it should be borne in mind, that that fault at any rate was not found in the Georgian era. Indeed perhaps something may after all have to be said in favour of a state of mind, which was certainly opposed to all that was morbid, and was not barren of achievement either in the intellectual or the practical world. We ought to pause before giving too ready an ear to those who would condemn the age of Lord Chatham and Bishop Butler. The latter participated in Warburton's distrust of Wesley; and a recognition of our debt to Wesley ought not to blind us to the real danger that lurked in the emotional and hysterical temper too often fostered by his preaching. Nowadays we have altered the force of the word "enthusiasm," and are ready enough to admire zeal on the sole condition of its sincerity. But it is no bad thing if we could learn, from

a despised prelate of a day that is not ours, that good intentions alone are no sufficient guide to right action; and that the use of what intelligence we possess in order to learn the path of wisdom is no less a duty than the pursuit of the course which approves itself. In a day when on the one hand Church problems are too often summarily settled by an appeal to principles not always understood and still more seldom investigated, and individual caprice is apt to be mistaken for a Divine mandate; and when on the other hand complex social and economic difficulties are dismissed with vague appeals to Christian sentiment or impatient denunciations of the methods of reflection as timid and sluggish, it is assuredly worth while to recall to memory a man who did try to mark out the distinctive spheres of political and religious activity, and recognized that emotional solutions of any problem must in the long run be tried by the trained intelligence.

This quality bears close relation to another characteristic of Warburton's that ought to command respect—his passion for study. A charge delivered to his clergy, marred though it be by his usual faults of taste, is yet memorable for its wise insistence on the duty of study for those men who would understand their work aright and make the most of opportunities. He is justly severe on those who are content to go through life with the smattering of knowledge needful to acquire a University degree. "Unhappily, by too short a view of things you have been apt to mistake the completion of your academic courses for the completion of your theologic studies; and then by a false modesty have despaired of knowing more than you would suffer those august places of your education to teach you"[1]. In order to correct this error he recommends them a course of reading, which in its width of range would appal the newly ordained deacon of an age which prides itself on its education. There is not space to quote it in full, but it includes the more important works of Locke, Grotius, Hooker, Taylor, Chillingworth, besides Cudworth's *Intellectual System* and Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae*, and many others. It would form an interesting comparison with some of the

[1] *Works* v. 589.

courses suggested by the Society of Sacred Study. At any rate such an admonition, if needful then, is surely no less needful now, when too many clergy think of reading as their last and least important duty, if it be a duty at all, and are even apt to boast that they are so much occupied with parochial effort that they have no leisure for thought.

Nor must it be forgotten that Warburton was in some respects in advance of his time, and that in matters where we should have expected him to share its prejudices. In no measured terms—his terms were seldom measured—he condemned the slave trade. He seems to have dimly realized the truth, now so familiar, that even Empire-making may partake of the character of missionary effort. Endeavouring to explain the failure of modern missions he declares the cause to lie in the fact that Roman Catholic Missions were solely concerned with the propagation of falsehood, and therefore of course they failed, whereas Protestant ignored the fact that Christianity presupposes civil society. They ought to begin with civilizing and then preach Christianity. "No great good will ever come of these missions, till the two great projects of civilizing and saving be joined in one." He was, surprisingly enough, an upholder of the rights of Convocation and a supporter of Atterbury's book at a time when such sentiments savoured of heresy[1]. And still stranger, those who dislike musical festivals in cathedral churches would find in Warburton an ardent ally[2].

But Warburton's two greatest merits were quite different from any of these minor points. *He realized the intellectual battle of his time and he was never afraid of his adversaries.*

[1] "I know you was afraid I might, some time or other, publicly declare myself with more warmth than was fitting, in favour of so unpopular a thing as Convocations. But I know how widely theory and practice differ; *fit* and *right* in politicks are two things, though in morals but one. I am convinced of the *rights* of Convocations; but the expediency of their frequent sitting is another matter. I believe all you say of the mischiefs they would produce. But I think we have avoided one extreme only by falling into another": *Letters to Hurd* 313.

[2] "You may judge by what I am going to say, what it is that passes under the name of *charity* amongst us. We have got for the distressed Clergy of the three Dioceses, some £340. And to procure this, we have levied upon the country £684 6*s.* 10*d.* for their entertainment in Fiddlers and Singers; of which sum, £100 is contributed by me and my coadjutor": Ibid. 440.

He speaks of the Church as fighting *pro aris et focis* with infidelity [1]. Nor, despite the contemporary distrust of his sincerity, can I doubt that he really cared for his faith, and believed himself to have a special mission to defend it. We may wish that he had done so more wisely and more sympathetically. But we cannot regret that he should have made the attempt. Much, too, may be forgiven to one who had ever before his eyes the shallow and inconsistent speculations of a Bolingbroke or even a Shaftesbury, with whose notion that whatever seems to conflict with the accepted canons of good taste must necessarily be impossible he makes himself very merry. In our own day unbelief is more profound, more sincere, and in every way more deserving of respect than it was in the age of Voltaire. But it is none the less real. It would hardly be an evil if Churchmen concerned themselves a little less with those within and a little more with those without. Then, perhaps, less time might be spent in ministering to sentimental and aesthetic sensibilities, and more to that of understanding real intellectual obstacles to faith, and showing that Christianity is a modern and not merely an ancient or medieval religion. In that case instead of exasperating the public by discussions on points, which, whatever their real significance, will always seem trivial to the outsider, we might devote ourselves to the incomparably more important, as it is more difficult, task of interesting, if we cannot convince, some of that large number of thoughtful and high-minded men, for whom Christianity holds no revelation and the Universe but little hope.

[1] The passage where this is stated is interesting, as affording further presumption of Warburton's sincerity, though of course it does not prove it. "Mr Mason (the poet) has called upon me, I found him yet unresolved whether he should take the living. I said, was the question about a mere secular employment, I should blame him without reserve if he refused the offer. But as I regarded going into orders in another light, I frankly owned to him he ought not to go unless he had a *call*; by which I meant, I told him, nothing fanatical or superstitious; but an inclination, and on that a resolution, to dedicate all his studies to the service of religion, and totally to abandon his poetry. This sacrifice I said, I thought was required at any time, but more indispensably so in this, when we are fighting with infidelity *pro aris et focis*": *Letters to Hurd* 171.

Lastly, as I said, Warburton was never afraid of his opponents. Doubtless this was the cause of his treating them with such discourtesy[1]. But the fault was not altogether on his side. Some apologists put in arguments on behalf of their belief like a culprit who admits his guilt but pleads extenuating circumstances. An attitude of almost conscious lameness does more damage than one of aggressive contempt. Further, this quality made Warburton the persistent opponent of clericalism, by which I mean a false attitude of mind, not a function of any particular opinions. He had as little patience with the half-hearted fighting of men who mistook outworks for the citadel, as he had with what seemed to him the merely childish tactics of the hostile forces. He felt this and was not ashamed to say it. He had his reward. He was the bugbear of bigots, as he admits, and was at all times fitter to conciliate the laity than the clergy[2]. It was the

[1] This is the kind of way he treats them: "I am ashamed of being longer serious with so idle a caviller. The English Bible lies open to every Free thinker of Great Britain; where they may read it that will and understand it that can": *Divine Legation* v. 342.

[2] His description of his position is valuable: "Our author indeed could talk big to the Free thinkers, for alas! poor men! he knew their weapons. All their arms were arguments, and those none of the sharpest; and wit, and that none of the brightest. But he had here to do with men in authority; appointed, if you will believe them, Inspectors-general over clerical faith. And they went forth in all the pomp and terror of Inquisitors; with suspicion before, condemnation behind, and their two assessors Ignorance and Insolence on each side. *We must suspect his faith* (say they). *We must condemn his book. We do not understand his argument.*" And again: "All this went for nothing with the Bigots. He had departed from the old posture of defence and had projected a new plan for the support of Revelation. *His demonstration*, says one of them, *if he could make one of it, could never make us amends for changing our posture of defence and deserting our strongholds.* For though they will talk indeed of the love of truth and the invincible evidence of our Faith, yet I know not how, even amidst all their zeal and fury they betray the most woful apprehensions of Christianity, and are frighted to death at every foolish book new-written against Religion, though it come but from the Mint or Bedlam. And what do our directing engineers advise you to, in this exigence? Do they bid you act offensively and turn the enemies' artillery upon them? By no means. Keep within your strongholds. Watch where they direct their battery, and then to your old mudwalls clap a buttress; and so it be done with speed, no matter of what materials. If in the meantime one more bold than the rest offer to dig away the rubbish that hides its beauty or kick down an awkward prop that discredits its strength, he is sure to

merit of the Church in the eighteenth century that it understood the layman's point of view, and that it aimed at conciliating his prejudices: and in this respect again Warburton is typical. That this attempt was not without danger is true; that the dangers were not avoided is also true. But the attempt in itself was not merely justifiable but praiseworthy. For whatever be the case with the State, Gambetta's phrase, "Le cléricalisme c'est l'ennemi," is assuredly true of the Church. And in a day when we seem more and more in danger from the seminarist ideal, we might do worse than take to heart something of the better side of a life which was one long protest against clericalism. True, Warburton sometimes fell a victim to its influence himself. Certainly his controversial method is not free from it. Yet in studying Warburton one feels more than ever the need of men who strive, even with slight success, to combat the cowardice which is the essence of clericalism, and the intellectual insincerity and practical intolerance which are its inevitable and disastrous outcome.

I must stop, or I shall be falling into the same errors. Warburton's defects were great, both as a man and a writer. And I trust that nothing here said can be interpreted as an attempt to deny them. But his cardinal fault he shared with his age. His method was purely negative, and he is always happiest at destruction. The notion that the way to root out error is by knock-down argument is at the bottom of most of the writing of the time, and is the cause why so little of the controversial literature of any age is of enduring value. It is the error of frontal attacks.

It is the constructive method that most effectually forwards the truth. To take an instance, how much more effectual a mode of meeting opposite views is that of such a book as the late Dr Hort's, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, than the myriad volumes of professed apologists! Warburton, with his turn for dialectics, felt that enough was done if logical weaknesses in his opponents' arguments could be pointed out, forgetting that argument is only the armour of belief and that

be called by these men . . . a secret enemy or an indiscreet friend": *Divine Legation*, preface to vol. III. xxvi–xxix.

the way to affect belief is by introducing fresh ideas beneath the joints and changing the outlook of the man[1]. But in this he was not singular in his day. His real merits were positive. I have tried to point them out. He had a passion for study and a belief that it was the office of a priest to do mental as well as practical work. He had a conviction that the Christian faith was essentially the most reasonable interpretation of human experience, whether that of the race or of the individual; that it was possible to commend it to the intellect of the educated man and worth while to make the attempt. And he had a courage and honesty which enabled him to see the facts of religious conditions in England—at least among the educated classes—as they actually were, unblinded by the prejudices of his profession, undismayed by the mockery of his adversaries[2]. Lastly, whatever deductions be made from his elaborate theory of the relations between Church and State, it is to his credit that he saw further than many of his contemporaries into the real meaning and purpose of an Established Church, of the correlative rights and duties it implied, and had a clearer view than his fellows of the effects of such a system in acting as a safeguard against bigotry[3].

[1] He knew indeed that the merely negative method was insufficient: "I should, I thought, be better employed for the future in establishing what I advance, than in removing prejudices to it—one only prejudice excepted, and that is in favour of Infidel writers, whom I never balk when they come in my way. Because this is not a temporary prejudice, but rose with Christianity, and will, I suppose, accompany it to the last. So it deserves a check. Perhaps I may have another temptation to it, and that is, the extreme ease in unravelling their sophistry. Long use has habituated me to it, and my friends have flattered me that I have something more clear and precise in this, than in the other parts. However, in rescuing Revelation from their talons, I only take those occasions which afford me an opportunity of setting it in a right light, not only from their misrepresentations, but from the cloudy systems of some of its defenders": *Letters to Hurd* 237.

[2] "The Church like the ark of Noah is worth saving, not for the sake of the unclean beasts and vermin that almost filled it, and probably made most noise and clamour in it, but for the little corner of rationality that was as much distressed by the stink within, as by the tempest without": ibid. 114.

[3] "Certain friends of Liberty, under the terror of the mischiefs done to Society by Fanaticism, or Religion run mad, had by a strange preposterous policy encouraged a clamour against Establishments: the only mode of Religion which can prevent what they pretended to fear; that is, its degenerating into Fanaticism": *Divine Legation,* dedication to vol. iii.

X

CHARLES SIMEON

1759–1836

BY

C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A.

RECTOR OF STOKE-UPON-TRENT

CHARLES SIMEON

When in 1783 Peace closed at last the struggle of American Independence, the newly-founded Evangelical party in the Church of England encountered a great peril. Its most brilliant orator, George Whitefield, and its most skilful organizer, John Wesley, had practically separated themselves from the Church.

Binding together his societies with the firm force of his will, and securing their unity with extraordinary foresight, John Wesley had taken steps which were to make Methodism a sect, free from the control of the bishops, and with its own ideals of theology.

But the movement had left in the Church of England a great number of saintly clergymen, who entirely refused to give up her ancient order, would call themselves by no man's name, longed for the support of their natural leaders in the hierarchy, and regretted that the bishops of the day, chosen under the cold auspices of the Whigs, would extend so little help to their efforts for the conversion of the nation. The men were marked out among their fellows, but rather by the strictness and piety of their lives than by any peculiarity of doctrine. They were essentially teachers of practice. They spoke as messengers from God Himself.

The strength of these Evangelicals lay in the parochial system. Supported by their congregations, and protected by the law, the Evangelical incumbents were safe enough from any serious interference on the part of the most hostile bishop. Outside, in occasional visits to one another, they could only be subjected to small and harassing pin-pricks, such as the

demand to see their letters of Orders, with which the bishop's officials would occasionally check them as they mounted the pulpit stairs. Romaine, Venn, Grimshaw, Fletcher of Madeley, Robinson of Leicester, did a most successful work in their own parishes, careless of the vexed glances of authority.

But about all this there was no permanence. The problem was, how to give the party, its system, and its doctrines a well-constructed corner in the vast and varied building of the English Church. The key to the ultimate success of the Evangelicals in taking so high and prominent a place in the Church life of the nineteenth century seems to me to be found in the career of Charles Simeon, who more than any other man fitted himself to the needs of the crisis which I have described. But while he went further than the desire for local power, no one more highly appreciated, no one more diligently worked to obtain that intense local influence which is so conspicuous a tradition with the great men of our English system.

Two of the famous Evangelical clergy especially struck Simeon with admiration, as he witnessed their local labours.

Fletcher of Madeley he himself describes at work:

"As soon as Simeon entered Fletcher's house and told him that he was come to see him, as his journey lay that way, Mr Fletcher took him by the hand, and brought him into the parlour, where they spent a few minutes in prayer, that a blessing might rest upon his visit. As soon as they had done prayer, Mr Fletcher asked him if he would preach for him. After some hesitation Mr Simeon complied, and away they went to church. Here Mr Fletcher took up a bell and went through the whole village ringing it, and telling every person he met that they must come to church, for there was a clergyman from Cambridge come to preach to them. The account which Mr Simeon gives of his behaviour during the whole of his visit gives one an equal idea of his goodness and of his zeal for the cause of God. He came to a smith's shop, in the course of one of their walks together during the period, and could not forbear entering it. And here it is astonishing how he spake to the several persons who were labouring in it. To one of them, who was hammering on the anvil, 'Oh,' says he, 'pray to God that He may hammer that hard heart of

yours.' To another, that was heating the iron, 'Ah, thus it is that God tries His people in the furnace of affliction.' And so he went round, giving to every one a portion suitable to the business in which he was engaged. To another, when a furnace was drawing, 'See, Thomas, if you can make such a furnace as that, think what a furnace God can make for ungodly souls'"[1].

Thomas Robinson of Leicester, a distinguished scholar at Cambridge, and Fellow of Trinity, presented to the vicarage of St Mary's, Leicester soon after his ordination, because of the popularity of his extraordinary gifts of preaching, was ten years older than Simeon. He was still more distinctly local in his influence than the earliest Evangelicals. Possessed of great power of working rapidly and arranging his time carefully and without waste, he ministered in the gaol and the hospital, as well as in his large parish, with indefatigable diligence. He was head of a score of institutions for the benefit of the poor. Day schools, almshouses, sick relief funds, grew up under his creative hand. He died at last suddenly, and in the full exercise of his influence, because his multifarious duties had exhausted his splendid vitality. The following sketch of him is by a fellow-clergyman at Leicester, E. T. Vaughan, Vicar of St Martin's, himself a famous Evangelical parish priest, whose power is shown by the fact that he often gathered some five hundred souls to the Holy Communion on "Sacrament Sunday."

I leave the picture, with all its grotesqueness and simplicity.

"Mr Robinson rose soon after six; omitted many particulars of his dressing, and quickly retired into his study, where he performed his private devotions, and took an early breakfast between seven and eight o'clock. He continued in his retirement till the hour of family breakfast, after which he united with his household in domestic worship. This early part of the day was what he most valued, as affording him the only moments he could ensure for uninterrupted reflection. Letters of importance; thoughts for preaching; plans, which required a calm judgement, had their place here. If he wished to converse privately with a friend upon interesting matters, he admitted him to his private breakfast; and seemed

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon*, 3rd ed., p. 80. This is the chief authority for Simeon's life; Canon Carus was his curate and intimate friend.

to aim at something of Mr Romaine's preciseness about the earliness of his hour. In his family worship he frequently varied his plan, and that upon principle. . . .

"Soon after his family worship he completed his dressing and went out; but not before he had received many visitors, rich and poor, who came to him upon business. His morning out-going was devoted to calls and visits: the most important and difficult cases of the sick he attended in the forenoon; his parishioners, friends, and various members of his congregation it was his practice to call upon, with some regularity; and he would make many short visits of this kind, with his watch in his hand, that he might not exceed his five or ten minutes.

"I believe he judged very prudently in imagining that such visits, though apparently too short to do much good, were useful and necessary. Few comparatively of his stated hearers could say, they never saw him in their houses.

"If he was to make many such visits they must be short. He generally contrived to drop some profitable remark; asked if they had anything particular to say; gave them reason to believe that he felt a real interest in their welfare, and convinced them that he was ready if at any time they might want him for more urgent services. He returned home to his luncheon between twelve and one o'clock, and then, if the weather were favourable, took his exercise for an hour or two with Mrs Robinson; a recreation, which greatly promoted his health and vigour, and of which he had been too sparing in his earlier life. He was to be seen near his own door again at a stated moment, when he dined. . . .

"About an hour after dinner he went out again, to make a few more visits which required less stretch of mind than those of the morning, and spent the rest of the evening after tea, when he had no engagement with company either abroad or at home, in some lighter reading, letter-writing, accounts, and conversation with his family. After his last devotions, and before he went to bed, he had three little books to settle: his own money account, the account of his charity purse, and a short diary . . . in which he noted all he had done in the day"[1].

Such a teacher deliberately confined his influence, except for an occasional preaching tour, to the town in which he lived. Either Robinson or Vaughan would in all probability have made remarkable diocesan bishops; they would hardly have shown themselves great ecclesiastical statesmen.

[1] Vaughan, *Life of Robinson* 226–9 passim.

It was the glory of Charles Simeon that he succeeded in combining local strength with imperial ideas. His first plan was almost as daring and its success seemed almost as improbable as the effort of Philip Neri[1] years before to convert to religion the Papal City of Rome, and even the Papal Curia itself. It produced an astonishing harvest, and gave an inspiration which is still alive in the English Church.

Charles Simeon determined to evangelize the University of Cambridge. Born in 1759, a few years before the Peace of Paris (1763), and a few months before the accession of King George III, at a time when the greatness of England was at its height, in the town of Reading, of gentle parents, and of an ancient family, he was elected to a scholarship on the Royal foundation of Eton, and succeeded in the ordinary and easy course at nineteen to a scholarship, and eventually to a fellowship, on the sister foundation of King's College, Cambridge. It was in the year 1778 that he went up to the University, during the dark struggle with the American colonies, when the great English race, as if driven mad by the exuberance of its invincible power, was engaged in tearing itself asunder, and when all thoughtful men were perplexed with the anxieties of the future.

On one of the fast days ordered in the course of that war, while he was still at Eton, young Simeon had set himself to practise fasting, amid the jeers of his fellow scholars. It was the first of his religious impressions; an effort to propitiate God, whose judgements were dealt out so sternly to the once victorious nation.

The next impression was far deeper. He was summoned by the Provost of King's on his arrival at Cambridge, in the natural course prescribed by the College rules, to present himself at the Holy Communion. As he looked at the formal notice lying on his table, the tremendous meaning of the situation in which he was to find himself stood in threatening severity before his trembling conscience. He, gay, careless, thoughtless youth, had to kneel in the most intimate presence of God Himself. How could he dare to meet God? What

[1] See his *Life* by Capecelatro.

could be the result but utter ruin? Eagerly he turned to the only spiritual book he had heard of, to *The Whole Duty of Man.* Sternly he examined his past; "crying," as he tells us, "to God for mercy." Three weeks of reading, fasting, and praying left him ill and prostrate; but he had come to understand that "the salvation of my soul was the one thing needful." He was sure of God's Being. Never again did he lose hold of personal religion.

Naturally the situation out of which such a potent spiritual life emerged left upon his mind an ineradicable impression. Again and again in his journals and letters are references to the blessed interviews with God in the Holy Sacrament; and by the number and earnestness of the communicants he often measures the spiritual progress of a congregation.

The young King's scholar persisted in his religious studies. Bishop Wilson on the Lord's Supper and Kettlewell on the Sacrament were read and consumed with the fierce hunger of spiritual anxiety; and on Easter Day, 1779, he awoke with Hallelujah on his lips, "Jesus Christ is risen to-day, Hallelujah," and he "had the sweetest access to God in the Holy Communion"[1].

Bishop Wilson had taught him "that the Jews knew what they did when they transferred their sins to the head of their offering." He had transferred his sins, and laid them on the sacred head of Jesus Christ. "I remember," he writes in his journal on the occasion of that all-important Easter communion of 1779, "there being more bread consecrated than was sufficient for the communicants, the clergyman gave some of us a piece more of it after the service; and on my putting it into my mouth, I covered my face with my hands and prayed. The clergyman, seeing it, smiled at me; but I thought if he had felt such a load taken off his soul as I did, and had been as sensible of his obligations to the Lord Jesus as I was, he would not deem my prayers and praises at all superfluous."

The services of the beautiful college chapel were now regularly attended by the young man, whose heart was all aglow with that passionate love for the Saviour which none

[1] Carus, *Simeon* 16.

can understand but those who have known the joy of it, and which St Paul describes in the eager saying, "the love of Christ constraineth us."

To Simeon, the society of Cambridge, with its petty jealousies, its little personal interests, its story-tellings, and its scholars battling over minute points of criticism, seemed an insult to the wonderful world of reality in which he now lived with Christ and all the company of heaven. He was beset with a most inspiring desire to free the University from its chains. To this cause it would be worth while to dedicate his life; and to try to construct in one of the intellectual capitals of England a society of servants of the Gospel of Jesus. It was this bright sense of a mission now descending upon his soul which distinguished Simeon from all the remarkable men of the second generation of Evangelical teachers. One of his pupils, it is true, lived a life so tragical in its brevity, so entirely self-sacrificing, so full of genius, that it has exercised a still greater influence on the religious England of all time. But the popular voice has as truly and fairly nicknamed the Evangelicals Simeonites, and not Martynites, as it has called the other school by the name of Dr Pusey, and not of John Henry Newman.

At this period of his development he had the good fortune (was it not of God's shaping?) to meet two men, father and son, who mightily helped him.

Henry Venn, the Rector of Yelling, twelve miles from Cambridge, was the practical theologian of the first Evangelical group. He was born in 1724, thirty-five years before Simeon, and ten years after Whitefield, and obtained a scholarship at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he was noted for his genial cheerfulness. This made him very popular in the University; and his popularity increased when he became a cricketer of high repute. But the week before he was ordained, he threw down his bat at the close of a match between Surrey and All England, in which he had distinguished himself, with the words, "Whoever wants a bat which has done me good service may take that." His friends eagerly inquired the cause. "I am to be ordained next Sunday," he

answered, "and I will never have it said of me, 'Well struck, Parson.'" On him, as on so many, Law's *Serious Call* exercised a profound influence; and this continued for some years, until he noticed and noted the small importance which Law appeared to attach to the Sacrifice of Christ; and then, with the words "Henceforth I will call no man master," he set himself to the exclusive study of the Bible. As curate of Clapham he became intimate in the house of the Thorntons, the centre of the group of Evangelicals living on Clapham Common; and exercised a considerable influence on the future of that famous coterie. In 1759, when thirty-five, he accepted the vicarage of Huddersfield, where the church was speedily crowded with persons from all quarters, inquiring, "What shall I do to be saved?" The chief feature of his teaching was the need for a personal love for Jesus Christ. First an Arminian and then a moderate Calvinist, he was convinced that this point of difference was of small importance if Jesus Christ was dear to the soul. For the training of souls in spiritual religion he put out his *Complete Duty of Man*, a modification of the *Whole Duty of Man*, which held for long a very prominent place among practical works of religion[1]. The enemies of Methodism detested him. "Don't you think," said one of them (Bishop Warburton), "Venn and Whitefield would make a proper as well as a pleasant figure in a couple of bearskins?"

This captivating and earnest clergyman had come to live in Yelling, when his shattered health obliged him to relinquish Huddersfield in 1771, and there Simeon was introduced to him. For the sake of his faith Venn had struggled through a long period of grinding poverty; he had seen his son refused admission to Trinity College, Cambridge, because his father was an Evangelical, a Methodist if you will; now his old age was gladdened by the appearance of the young Fellow of King's, uncompromising in his confession of sin, and in his confidence that Christ's Blood had paid the price of his redemption, resolutely setting himself to the conversion of the University.

[1] Memoir prefixed to *Complete Duty of Man* (Religious Tract Society).

Henry Venn became the counsellor, as his son John Venn became the confidant, of Charles Simeon. Through the long period of opposition and persecution which lay before Simeon, Yelling Rectory was a haven of rest, to which he repaired for prayer and spiritual communion.

Sorely did Simeon need all the help that the Venns could give him. Memoirs of the time show us the wild and reckless extravagance of large groups of graduates and undergraduates. Immorality was very prevalent. Two Fellows of King's were notorious for gambling, and for the gains they made out of young nobles. There was a vast deal of blatant unbelief. "I wish to see King's College Chapel made a stable of," said one of the citizens. "Drunkenness was at that time a sin besetting the educated classes; it had not yet extended to the peasantry of the country." In drunkenness too King's was specially degraded. The interests of men were of the most trifling character; personal feelings were allowed unbounded licence. The churches round Cambridge were mostly served by Fellows of Colleges, who were very careless in their performance of duty. "Stay to dinner with me," said a Lincolnshire baronet to one of them, "and I will send a guinea to the Churchwardens, which will be a satisfactory cause for the absence of the parson, unless your county differs much from mine"[1]. The most popular preacher in Cambridge, a Baptist, was teaching that Christ is not divine, and was beginning to call in question the very existence of God. His sermons were eagerly discussed by members of the University. Heterodoxy is always so delightfully attractive. And in this case it was so piquant to hear God's Being pronounced doubtful in a house built for His service[2].

One or two professors, of whom Farrish was the most conspicuous, timidly represented spiritual religion. Magdalene, we are told, was the only college where religion was encouraged before 1788.

This Augean stable seemed beyond the reach of human

[1] Gunning, *Reminiscences*; Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*; Professor Pryme, *Autobiography*, &c.

[2] Stoughton, *Religion under the Georges* ii. 281–4.

power to cleanse, but its new Hercules dared the venture in the power of the Holy Spirit.

On May 26, 1782, Charles Simeon was ordained deacon by Bishop Yorke of Ely. He began his ministry as curate in St Edward's Church, Cambridge, in the pulpit (he himself notes it) where Bishop Latimer had preached many famous sermons at the Reformation. The church was soon crowded; a thing unknown there for more than a century. The Venns wrote enthusiastically and full of hope. But in October a still better opportunity for the work of conversion offered itself. The vicar of Trinity Church, Cambridge, died. Often had Simeon, as he walked past it, remarked to himself what a platform this church, one of the largest in Cambridge, and standing in the heart of the town, would afford for the preaching of the Gospel. There he could be "a herald for God in the midst of the University." A few weeks before his Ordination he had visited it on Sacrament Sunday, and found three communicants. Now he was startled by a letter written in October, 1782, by Bishop Yorke, who was a friend of his father, offering him the desirable incumbency; desirable for the opportunity of converting the University, most undesirable in point of income, which was almost non-existent, £40 a year: most undesirable also from the nature of the congregation of town tradesmen and middle-class people, who were particularly hostile to any enthusiasm, or methodism as they styled it. The personal love of Christ, the salvation of the soul through faith in the Great Sacrifice, the guidance of the Inward Voice, this was the message Simeon felt inspired to proclaim[1].

At once there arose a furious opposition. But Simeon was sure the call was of God's doing. His fellowship at King's gave him a home and an income. As for the conflict, "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you." It was necessary to endure tribulation for Christ's sake. The seat-holders absented themselves, and locked their seats. But the

[1] In 1795 the population of Cambridge was: Citizens, 8,942; Members of the University, 805; Servants in College, 121; Total, 9,868. Trinity parish had nearly 2,000 inhabitants.

aisles afforded space, and were crowded with worshippers. New galleries were put up to give accommodation to the throngs of men come from curiosity, from opposition, or from sincere desire to know the truth. The churchwardens locked the church doors against the congregation for the evening service. The new vicar found his opportunity in the morning. By hiring a room near at hand he was able to give fuller instruction to the numbers who came to ask for guidance. Mr Venn writes with eager hope: "We may indeed say a great door is opened, for gownsmen hear him. What follows is as true, and there are many adversaries. The 'Wonderful Counsellor' is with him. I advised him to visit a poor felon in the gaol, whose case was put into the papers, as accessory to a murder. He answered, 'Oh, I have been with him several times, and I hope he will go from the gallows to glory.' His father, who used to delight in him, is all gall and bitterness—I should not wonder if he were to disinherit him. The Lord will be his portion if it is so."

The opposition had no compunction in the methods which it used. Drunkenness, gambling and impurity do not enter into controversy with a man of God in white kid gloves. The evil livers were determined to put Simeon down by calumny or by force. For years the behaviour round his church was a disgrace to the town and to the university, whose mutual jealousies made it particularly difficult to re-establish order. An eye-witness relates how he saw Simeon on his return to King's with his face and clothes streaming with the rotten eggs which had been hurled at him as he left the church. Within the sacred building he had to organize a voluntary police to prevent disturbances; while the noises outside rendered worship difficult. One of the Fellows of King's was accustomed to watch visitors from the country as they came to his rooms, and annoy them with gibes and questions. Occasionally the young preacher was stung to madness. One gentleman he brought before the magistrates, and insisted that he should be sent to gaol for brawling. An undergraduate who had often disturbed the service was captured. He was compelled to read a public apology before

the crowded congregation of Trinity Church; and as Simeon thought it was not delivered distinctly enough, he took it from his hand and trumpeted it through the Church while the unhappy culprit stood blushing and trembling by his side. There was a stubbornness and a stern fierceness about the man in his early days which those who knew him in later life found it difficult to credit. He felt as a soldier of the Lord surrounded with God's enemies. To control himself he had often to repeat "The servant of the Lord must not strive." Only the real depth of his personal piety secured him from growing bitter.

The fearlessness of the man, his wonderful influence over many conspicuous sinners, the evident sincerity of his manner, his clear and pointed style of preaching, his magnificent charity in succouring the poor and miserable during the early years of the Great War, gradually brought his opponents to admire or at least to respect the young Vicar of Trinity. In a few years he was one of the most prominent personalities in Cambridge. Undergraduates always are attracted by an unpopular cause: there was a touch of chivalry in helping him; there was further in their support of a leader whom the tutors and professors disliked a certain spice of pleasurable excitement, for in helping Simeon they were thwarting the wishes of their superiors. Many of the young men who came at first to mock Simeon stayed to pray with him. They felt that he stepped out of the presence chamber of God to speak and to teach.

A friend tells us: "During the period of my residence at King's, Mr Simeon invariably rose every morning, though it was the winter season, at four o'clock; and, after lighting his fire, he devoted the first four hours of the day to private prayer, and the devotional study of the Scriptures. He would then ring his bell, and calling in his friend with his servant, engage with them in what he termed his family prayer"[1].

The next incident recalls the medieval saints: "It was one day in 1794, when Marsden, the apostle of New Zealand

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon* 58.

and one of Simeon's disciples, found Simeon 'so absorbed in the contemplation of the Son of God and so overpowered with a display of His mercy to his soul, that he was incapable of pronouncing a single word, till at length after an interval, in a tone of strange significance, he exclaimed, 'Glory, Glory'"[1].

These were the weapons of his conflict.

In 1786 he was asked to preach in the University pulpit. "The greatest excitement prevailed on this occasion. St Mary's was crowded with gownsmen; and at first there seemed a disposition to disturb and annoy the preacher, in a manner at that period, unhappily, not unusual. But scarcely had he proceeded more than a few sentences, when the lucid arrangement of his exordium, and his serious and commanding manner, impressed the whole assembly with feelings of deep solemnity, and he was heard to the end with the most respectful and rivetted attention. The vast congregation departed in a mood very different from that in which it had assembled; and it was evident, from the remarks which were overheard at going out, and the subdued tone in which they were made, that many were seriously affected, as well as surprised, at what they had heard. Of two young men who had come among the scoffers, one was heard to say to the other, 'Well! Simeon is no fool, however!' 'Fool!' replied his companion, 'did you ever hear such a sermon before?'

"The ridicule and contempt he had hitherto encountered began now in some measure to abate; though still he had not unfrequently to endure, even in his own church and in the time of divine service, the most insolent and profane behaviour from some of the junior members of the University"[2].

It was much more to the undergraduates than to the citizens that he felt himself sent. He set to work to consolidate his influence over them. For some time he had been studying deeply the composition of sermons. Taking as his text-book a work on "the composition of a sermon" by a famous French Huguenot divine, Claude, he began to give

[1] Moule, *Simeon* 214. [2] Carus, *Life of Simeon* 57.

lectures on preaching to the undergraduates who intended to take Orders. To help them he composed great numbers of sermons in summary, or, as he styled it, "in skeleton," and with his wonted lack of humour, published volumes of these so-called "skeletons." The enemy saw occasion to mock. The undergraduates, who found the benefit of his help, crowded to the preparation class in the Fellow's rooms at King's College. He encouraged them by his own example. "When I began to write at first," he said, "I knew no more than a brute how to make a sermon, and after a year or so, I gave up writing and began to preach from notes. But I so stammered and stumbled that I felt this was worse than before, and so I was obliged to take to a written sermon again. At last, however, the *reading* a sermon appeared to be so stiff and heavy that I once more made an attempt with notes, and determined, if I did not now succeed, to give up preaching altogether." He continued this method almost to his death; but in his latest years once more used sermons written out at full length, and which had been composed in the days of his fullest mental vigour.

But this instruction had its bad effect. Through constantly lecturing others on their faults of style, Simeon contracted for himself an artificial habit as the years went on. Here is the description of him by a critical but admiring auditor:

"Yet he to whom this homage was rendered, was a man of ungraceful address; with features which ceased to be grotesque only when they became impassioned; with a voice weak and unmusical; and to whom no muse was propitious. His habits, and his very theory of composition, were such as seemed to promise empty pews and listless auditors; for every discourse was originally constructed (to use his own phrase) as a 'skeleton,' with all the hard processes and the fine articulations as prominent as his logical anatomy could render them—the bony dialectic being then clothed with the fibrous and muscular rhetoric, in such manner as the meditations of the preceding, or the impulses of the passing hour, might suggest"[1].

[1] Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography* ii. 371, 372.

The rooms at King's became little by little the centre of religious life among the Cambridge undergraduates. There was an evening each week for sermon composition; and another evening for explanation and social discussion of the Scripture.

Thomas Thomason, afterwards his curate, writes in 1792: "Mr Simeon watches over us as a shepherd over his sheep. He takes delight in instructing us, and has us continually in his rooms. He has nothing to do with us as respects our situation at college. His Christian love and zeal prompt him to notice us." And writing to his mother, he says: "God has heaped upon me more favours than ever. Mr Simeon has invited me to his Sunday evening lectures. This I consider one of the greatest advantages I ever received. The subject of his lectures is natural and revealed religion"[1].

When some years later he was a constant preacher in the University pulpit, a large part of the great church was occupied with men who felt themselves to be his followers, while the crowd in general realized that he now held the place of a Leader in the English Church. Men were trained by him to preach, to think, to study and to believe, and sent out to every corner of the kingdom with the message of the Gospel, as Simeon understood it. He was become a power throughout the land.

A listener in Edinburgh in 1798 thus describes a passage in one of his sermons:

"Simeon supposed the keeper of the Inch Keith lighthouse to have let the light go out, and that in consequence the coast was strewed with wrecks, and dead and mangled bodies; and that the wailing widows and orphans were everywhere heard. He supposed the delinquent brought out for examination before a full court and an assembled people, and at last the answer to be given by him that he was asleep.—'Asleep!' The way in which he made this '*asleep*' burst on the ears of his audience, who were hanging in perfect stillness on his lips, I remember to this day."

The stern uncompromising earnestness of the man is thus

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon* 78, 79.

brought out by the same auditor: "I remember on another occasion, in Edinburgh, after having finished an impressive discourse, his standing up and stopping a merry jig which was commencing from the organ. He had been preaching on the eternal covenant. 'No music,' he cried; 'let the people retire in silence and think upon the covenant.'"

"Speak to me of heaven," he once said to a fellow clergyman who began talking of travels after a sermon; "speak to me of heaven, but do not speak to me of earth at this moment, for I cannot talk about it"[1].

But so far, the work was entirely personal. It lived, it is true, but under the constant inspiration of its founder, training individual preachers to proclaim Christ crucified. Would it die with its founder, and be forgotten? It is the glory of the Simeonite movement that it left a mark, perhaps permanent, certainly conspicuous to this day, on the life of the English Church. Simeon was the real originator of the Church Missionary Society, which continues to be the very focus of Evangelicalism, and the rallying point of Evangelical laymen and clergymen; the noblest justification of their party existence; a work so splendidly true to the Gospel, carried out with so fervent a zeal for Christ, ever glowing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that none could deny that its life and its origin must be of God. There is a freemasonry among C.M.S. men; for the consciousness of the power of that institution, so instinct with life in its devotion and its work, binds all together who have been touched with its spiritual breath; and a look of reverence and awe comes upon the face of many a hard-worked clergyman and many a practical layman as he speaks tenderly of the Society, ennobled by its long roll of martyrs, and drawn heavenward by unceasing prayers. It has taken its followers outside the common rut of men, and shown them the vision of universal empire for Jesus Christ. It has refused to be daunted by the jealousy of merchants or the timidity of statesmen. It has added more than one province to the dominion of Britain, and has compelled, even in quite recent years, a Ministry

[1] Moule, *Simeon* 92-4.

conspicuously careless of religion to champion with the power of Britain the cause of the Cross of Christ among the heathen.

Of this great Society Charles Simeon was the true progenitor. Other men, more practical and more in touch with the world, gave it its shape and founded its financial success. But he was the first to set his hand to the plough, and his fearless voice roused his comrades from their early discouragement to go forward and to proclaim the Gospel to the heathen. Professor Handley Moule, now Bishop of Durham, to whom all students of Simeon must be so deeply indebted, still holds the letter which was sent to the young Cambridge clergyman of twenty-eight, calling from the distant Macedon of Hindustan to the English Church, "Come over and help us." The letter was sent from Calcutta. It had four signatures. The first was one of Simeon's own college contemporaries, David Brown, who from Simeon's group of friends had offered himself for a chaplaincy on the establishment of the East India Company, in the hope that an opportunity might show itself to preach Christ to the heathen also. David Brown had gone to India in 1786; now in 1787 he pointed out to his friends Simeon as the man who could help them if he would.

Help them if he would! Was not his heart aglow with longing for the millions who had never heard of the Christ who was his hourly companion? Help them if he would! Did he not ponder day and night on the problem of covering India with missionaries? Fighting almost with wild beasts at Cambridge, with hardly a single man of distinction in the University to give him countenance; so lonely that he might not expect one of his colleagues to take his arm or keep pace side by side with him as he walked on the wide smooth lawns of King's, he still found time and vigour to pray and plan for that dark India over which England was slowly stretching out her powerful arm, but in which English rulers trembled at the very notion of permitting the presence of a missionary of the Cross. But now David Brown, the clergyman, was supported by three prominent civilians, administrators under the Company, saddened at the neglect of religion among Englishmen in India which made the Gospel of Christ present

so uninviting an aspect to thoughtful and upright Hindus, and eager to wipe away the reproach from the Lord who was so dear to themselves. One of these three signatories, Charles Grant, was afterwards to become the leader of the Court of Directors in Leadenhall Street, and did more than any man to secure for missionaries the good countenance of the Government. These men asked Simeon to become their English agent and to send out from England suitable teachers who for £50 a year would preach the Gospel to the heathen.

Schwartz was already at work in Southern India; but the only mission to Bengal had been obliged to find shelter in the Danish settlement of Serampore, and was conducted by the famous Baptists, Carey and Marshman. The English Church had none to represent her, and at present she could find none. To Simeon's most eager efforts and summons to the work there was no response. He could not himself leave his life in his rooms at King's, which he had made the centre of training for Evangelicals, without bringing his movement into complete collapse. He had not yet fired his hearers with that self-denying flame of grace which would stimulate them to suffer contumely and endure hardness for the Gospel in heathen lands. One thing, however, he could and did do. Gradually a little group of men trained under him joined David Brown on the establishment of Indian chaplains. Highly paid, they devoted the larger part of their incomes to the maintenance of schools for native children, and began the literary study of the languages, and the translation of the Bible.

John Venn, the son of Henry, and the college friend of Simeon, had been appointed Rector of Clapham. There he came into contact with that little group of pious and clever laymen, who have been placed on a pedestal of fame by their long and successful war against slavery. The story of the Clapham Evangelicals has been told us by one of its members, Sir James Stephen, who as a boy listened to the eloquent talk of William Wilberforce, and the calm political discussions of Henry Thornton, and who in his inimitable style has made the houses and gardens of Clapham alive

to all ages with the strong figures of his instructors. Thornton had been early introduced to Simeon, and had given him much shrewd advice in his struggles at Holy Trinity. The friendship of Wilberforce was still more important, for he was the intimate companion of the all-powerful Minister[1], who had just been chosen by the King and the people to uphold the empire, left in ruins when the Peace of Versailles in 1783 closed the disastrous war in America. Wilberforce delighted in Simeon's society. He writes in 1797: "Simeon with us, his heart glowing with the love of Christ. How full he is of love and of desire to promote the spiritual benefit of others! Oh that I might copy him, as he Christ"[2]! These men did their utmost to give the Government of India at least some religious tinge, and through Charles Grant, and by Simeon's advice, obtained appointments as chaplains for Thomason and Corrie, and, most famous of all, Henry Martyn. The Clapham Sect, as it came to be called, had no very hearty affection for the Church of England. It was natural that when it took up more and more warmly the project of a Christian Missionary Society, it should be desirous to form this on a basis of undenominationalism. Thus the London Missionary Society in 1795 was the first result of the missionary enthusiasm which Simeon had done so much to foster. Largely supported to this day by Churchmen, who perhaps from want of practical experience believe in the possibility of undenominational teaching, it utterly failed to satisfy Simeon's aspirations. Simeon was one of the strictest Churchmen that ever breathed. True to the Prayer Book and true to Episcopacy, a firm believer in the necessity of the Sacraments, he foresaw a number of difficulties in the new departure, practical difficulties which would embarrass the missionaries sorely when they made their first converts.

At home he was always exceedingly jealous of any tendency among his people to be "drawn away by the

[1] The mass of the Evangelicals were devoted to Pitt, and strongly supported the policy of the French war, even from the pulpit: Vaughan, *Life of Robinson*, passim.

[2] *Life of William Wilberforce* ii. 226.

Dissenters"; and speaking of a conference of his friends on missionary work, he says: "This point was unanimously assented to, that the London Missionary Society was not formed upon those principles which were either calculated to produce success, or to justify our publicly uniting with them." An undenominational society was not to him the true method of working among the heathen, though he wished God-speed to the new Society. Therefore he still pressed on his associates that a definitely Church Society was wanted, if the Church as a whole was to be inspired with the ambition to fulfil the Master's bidding. And in 1799 the Church Missionary Society came into existence. It was very tiny. Twelve hundred pounds represented its narrow income; but its founders were confident that not only Africa and India, but China and Japan also, would soon be entered by its agents. Simeon was one of the first to preach the anniversary sermon, the chief event of the Society's year; but when its life was once begun he played no great part in developing its organization. He was the man to inspire, not the man to construct. He was at Cambridge; the home of the Society was in London. It is to John Venn, and Thomas Scott, and Robert Cecil, and Josiah Pratt that the great Society owes its constitution; but none the less, the true founder was Charles Simeon, the man whom nothing could discourage, and before whom the plain duty of preaching the good news of Christ to the heathen set itself day and night as a work that must be done[1].

All the first set of men who went from Cambridge went, as we have seen, to be chaplains to the English stations in India. The most famous of them all was Henry Martyn, and if Simeon had done nothing more than inspire Henry Martyn to be a missionary, his name would deserve to rank high among the supporters of missionary enterprise.

Born in 1781 at Truro, Martyn failed to win a Scholarship at Corpus Christi College Oxford; and at St John's College Cambridge, his mathematics were found so weak in the examination that he was almost denied admission. Yet in

[1] See Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society.*

1801 he was Senior Wrangler, and he was probably also the most brilliant Classical Scholar of his year. His power of learning languages was most extraordinary: a power which stood him in good stead as a missionary. For a time he was quite careless of religion. But in his undergraduate days the all-pervading influence of Simeon touched his heart. Henceforth the personal love of Christ was his first and chiefest passion. We learn in his diary how he chafed at hours spent in any conversation which was not religious. He became Simeon's curate, caught from Simeon the passion for the conversion of the heathen, obtained through Simeon, by the nomination of Charles Grant, an appointment as chaplain to India, translated the New Testament into Hindostani, and into Persian, and into Hindi, and for five years preached the Gospel in India. His chief duty was to minister to the English in the settlement at which he was posted. But in one way or another he found many opportunities to speak to the natives; sometimes to a crowd of beggars, sometimes to a gathering of women in the settlement[1]. To every one, everywhere, he was ready with his message. Then disease came upon him; he was ordered home. He insisted on travelling through Persia. There a striking incident will show the potent influence of this extraordinary man, who flashes like a meteor across the slow and steady history of Christian missions.

"Some years since an English gentleman spent several weeks at Shiraz; while there he met, one day at dinner, with Mohammed Rahem, a Persian of middle age, with a thoughtful, gentle countenance. The Englishman was full of levity. Mohammed silently reproved him with a look of surprise and sorrow. Our countryman was informed that the Persian was a learned priest, who had ceased to officiate, and who lived in retirement; and at a subsequent interview ascertained from him the particulars of his story. He said a beardless English youth, enfeebled by disease, had some time before come to that city, and dwelt there a year, teaching

[1] Sargent, *Memoir of Martyn*, passim. Sargent was one of the Simeon circle.

the religion of Christ. Mohammed treated with contempt the Christian teacher, but the latter persevered with so much love and gentleness as to convert Mohammed's contempt into esteem and affection. He gave him a tract, and entreated him to read it, and the result was the Persian felt the English youth was right. But fear and shame withheld the avowal of that conviction, and the Mohammedan shunned the society of the Christian. 'But just before he quitted Shiraz,' said the Persian, as he told this story, 'I could not refrain from paying him a farewell visit. Our conversation sealed my conversion. He gave me a book: it has ever been my constant companion; the study of it has formed my most delightful occupation; its contents have often consoled me.' Upon this, the narrator put into the Englishman's hands a copy of the New Testament in Persian; on one of the blank leaves was written, 'There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. Henry Martyn'"[1].

Simeon's love for Martyn is well shown in his own story of the arrival of Martyn's portrait at the India House:

"I could not bear to look upon it, but turned away, covering my face, and in spite of every effort to the contrary, crying aloud with anguish. E. was with me, and all the bystanders said to her, 'That, I suppose, is his father.' Shall I attempt to describe to you the veneration and love with which I look at it? . . . In seeing how much he is worn, I am constrained to call to my relief the thought in whose service he has worn himself so much; and this reconciles me to the idea of weakness, of sickness, or even, if God were so to appoint, of death itself." Martyn was just then dying at Tokat. The portrait ever after hung in Simeon's rooms at King's. "He never takes his eyes off me," said Simeon, "and seems always to be saying, 'Be serious, be in earnest, don't trifle, don't trifle'; and I won't trifle, I won't trifle"[2].

The foundation of the Church Missionary Society is to the

[1] Stoughton, *Religion under the Georges* ii. 378.

[2] J. B. Braithwaite, *Life of J. J. Gurney*; and Moule, *Charles Simeon* 139. Martyn died in 1812.

historian the great moment in the life of Simeon. The Society at first seemed to advance slowly. Bishops held aloof from it; great leaders even sneered at it; many derided its enthusiasm. But it proved on the one side to be a splendidly statesman-like conception, and at the same time the true point of union for the Evangelical party—a point of union which set their ideal so high, even the conversion of the world, that it could not fail to keep them spiritual.

Simeon himself was not a critical statesman. He never measured the greatness of his own work; and two other societies founded about this period seem to have appeared to him of even larger benefit and greater interest.

The Clapham Sect were not satisfied with putting an end to the Slave Trade. They were desirous to make the freed slaves Christians. For this, and for their many projects of evangelization at home and abroad, they wanted the Bible, and in 1804 they founded the Bible Society.

Though Simeon was not one of the originators of this Society, and though he never took any share in its government, he greatly helped to draw towards it the sympathies of Evangelical Churchmen. His friend Wilberforce did more than anybody to push the Society in early days. And another Clapham man, Sir John Shore, created Lord Teignmouth, and formerly Governor-General of India, was its first President. People remembered that Sir John Shore had held the greatest position in the Colonial Empire; and had governed many more millions of subjects than could be reckoned in the three kingdoms taken together. On his nod had depended peace or war; he had arranged the system of taxation, the moderation of which left ample daily bread to the dense population of Bengal. Now they saw the once potent ruler sitting quietly among men of no mark and surrendering all political influence in order to superintend the production, the issue, and the sale of copies of the Book, which a few years before its enemies had stigmatized as a bundle of fables; and feeling himself honoured because he was allowed to provide the inspired literature for the use of unknown missionaries at home and abroad. This spirit of earnest devotion among

so many of the greater laymen proved to the wondering world the reality of the Simeonite propaganda. To the quiet rooms in King's such men turned for counsel and for spiritual food, and never turned in vain; for the Evangelical President of the Council "de Propaganda Fide," though he was poor and humble, and very different in outward show to his Roman rival, lived so near to God and drew his knowledge so directly from the fountain-head, that he never failed to provide his friends with a draught of the Living Water when they were weary and fatigued.

Simeon was fond of recalling, with that simple childlike and unconscious vanity which sometimes annoyed strangers but seemed to his friends to add a fresh charm to his profound humility, the events by which the Bible Society had been introduced in Cambridge. His followers among the undergraduates had first taken it up in 1811. The days were anxious days for England, engaged in the last deadly struggle with Napoleon, and the grave dons shook their heads at the preposterous proposal that a number of undergraduates should be allowed to convene a meeting. Religion to-day, they said, but, as history shows us, politics to-morrow. Where will this lead? Better surely to nip it in the bud. The young men came to Simeon. "They would not have submitted," says he, "to any other. They left the matter in my hands." Simeon put forth all his power. The Evangelical dons, increasing in number and in boldness every year, came forward to follow their recognized chief. Heads of colleges professors, great nobles, even a Prince of the Blood, gave their support. Several important men spoke on the Bible Society's platform. "The unanimity," says Simeon in his letters to his friend Thomason, Chaplain and Missionary in Bengal, "was like the day of Pentecost. Many, many tears were shed on the occasion, and God Himself was manifestly present." The earnestness of the speakers and the large and numerous subscriptions testified to the reality of the movement. For the Bible Society Simeon made constant progresses through England, and rejoiced because it placed him on a common platform with his Nonconformist friends, of

whom John Joseph Gurney[1], the Quaker banker of Earlham, was the most intimate.

But his own special Society was the London Jews' Society, for converting the Jews throughout the world, so long outcast. To them, as the countrymen of Jesus Christ, his heart went out with an intense longing. In 1817 he writes of a special mission organized to travel through Holland, Russia, and Syria, inquiring into the condition of the Jews:

"What stay they will make I do not know; but it is probable they will be absent a year; as it is in their contemplation not only to go to Petersburg and Warsaw, but to be at Jerusalem at Easter. The state of the Jews in Russia and Poland is very encouraging. Very many are anxious to have the New Testament in Hebrew: and if the Jews (two millions of whom are in the Russian empire) can be furnished with that, there is reason to hope that many will find it the power of God to the salvation of their souls. . . . We have great reason to think that the Hebrew New Testament is doing good among the Jews in Poland and Germany. The fields there seem white, ready to the harvest. The Jews abroad are of a very different cast and complexion from the poor sordid people in England. We are going *at private expense* to take a chapel at Amsterdam, and send a chaplain there. In that city are 30,000 Jews. In less than a week the thing will be done: and if it succeed, so as to promise well, we shall, after two years of trial, bring it before the public. But till the experiment has been fully tried, the public will not be burdened with one shilling expense about it. I have a similar plan for Hamburg; only if I succeed there it will be without expense; there being already the train completely laid, and nothing remaining but to apply the *portefeu* to it.

"At home, also, blessed and adored be our God, all is going on well: my Church more thronged with gownsmen than ever; and my people going on better than for many years. The bad spirits are withdrawn, and peace and love are abounding in the midst of us"[2].

[1] See J. B. Braithwaite, *Life of J. J. Gurney.* [2] Carus, *Life of Simeon* 318.

A few months later he went himself to Amsterdam, and began preaching; and four years afterwards, in 1821, he writes: "Through the tender mercy of our God the Jewish cause is prospering. We have established a college or seminary for our missionaries; we have an excellent man for president, and we have four students, very hopeful ones, already there; I hope that in a year three of them will go forth; we could have a great number of others, but must wait for funds to enable us to provide on a larger scale. . . . I am going to give prizes for the best tracts on the Jewish question. . . . On February 18 and 25 I am to preach (D. V.) before the University on the Jewish question."

In 1821 he writes: "We have just established a Jews' Society in the University, and had a public meeting. Indeed, such is the state of the University now that multitudes are ready to come forward in every good work. It is no little mercy to have lived to such a day as this. When I was an undergraduate myself, I could not find one who feared God; now we can find many, who through the mercy of God are burning and shining lights"[1].

Indeed, by the year 1822, the condition of things and the position of Simeon was very encouraging. No longer were eggs and other missiles hurled at him on his way from his church to King's College. No longer did colleagues refuse to be seen walking with him, lest they should be supposed to have become tainted with the Simeonite poison. Bishops now called upon him, peers invited him to dinner, duchesses in England and in France wrote to him for spiritual counsel. He was become one of the principal attractions of the University pulpit. He had a recognized place in the University life. Young men were sent up by subscription from various parts of the country, candidates for the Ministry in the English Church, to be under his eye, to enjoy his society, to imbibe at his feet the doctrines which were felt to be all-precious by an ever-increasing body of Christians. To be a disciple of Simeon was become a title to respect and prefer-

[1] It is noticeable that, in 1829, J. J. Gurney writes of his visit to Oxford: "The young men seemed to overflow with love": *Life of Gurney* i. 377.

ment. Forty-one years had passed since he had knelt at the Communion in Trinity Church with two other communicants; thirty-nine since he had entered on his ministry in Trinity parish. The first ten years had been the years of conflict: then the victory had been won by his frank courage, his evident sincerity, the power of his personal faith, the evangelical beauty of the life which he taught.

In the twenty years which followed those years of bitter persecution, the evangelical party had taken shape and consolidated its organization as the aggressive force for Christ in the English Church. Strongly sacramental, yet not very definite in its teaching of the sacramental benefits and much more definite in its doctrine of conversion which its members held to be the real new Birth, devotedly loyal to the Church of England and the Prayer Book which Simeon again and again extolled as the noblest and most valuable manual of devotion, staunchly loyal to the episcopal order whose members had done nothing to help it and gave it no sympathy, the evangelical party now seemed likely to draw to itself all that was spiritual and Christlike in the Church of England, unless the two other historic parties, the Liberal and the Catholic as they styled themselves—better known to the outside world as the Broad and the High, the parties of Laud and of Tillotson—could awaken to their former energy, and produce saints and teachers who should vie in power with Charles Simeon. Could either of them produce martyrs in the missionary cause like Martyn and Corrie[1], statesmen like Wilberforce and Thornton, diligent parish priests like the Venns and Vaughan and Robinson? Could they give themselves a centre of gravity as attractive as the Church Missionary Society, or develop forces equal to the Bible Society, and the Religious Tract Society, and so inspire their followers to liberality, or instruct the multitudes without God in the land? These are themes which other lecturers must develop. The recollection of Julius Charles Hare and Maurice, Pusey and Newman and Marriott shall form the answer to this

[1] First Bishop of Madras; a very intimate disciple of Simeon. See his *Life* by his brothers. He died of overwork in 1837.

problem from the lecturer to-day. It is my allotted province to show you from the story of Simeon how high was the pillar to which this spiritual Stylites had now climbed. Other leaders of the party had gained a name and fame: the Milners were conspicuous for their learning; the brilliant cleverness of Henry Martyn and Kirke White dazzled all contemporaries; Wilberforce and Clarkson had become famous in the political arena. Of learning Simeon had little[1]; his preaching was a simple exposition, gaining force from its genuine feeling, as the speech of a man who testified what he had seen; he had won no high place in the examination halls, but had secured his Fellowship at King's because he was an Etonian and a Colleger. His theology shows in him no special power as a thinker; and it ceases to interest when it ceases to be immediately practical. Politics were never named by him in his most intimate correspondence and diaries. "I never touch on news or politics," he writes to Thomason in his sixty-first year. He could hardly be persuaded to vote at elections. Waterloo and Trafalgar, Napoleon and the Iron Duke have no place on his pages; yet with these enthralling topics to rival his, he had arrested men's attention, and compelled them to listen to the Gospel. His was a purely spiritual sovereignty over the hearts of men. The simple story from his correspondence will illustrate best this period of his life.

The first extract speaks of a visit to Ireland in support of various societies: "No sooner were we arrived than Irish hospitality evinced itself in an extraordinary degree. You who know the precise line in which I walk at Cambridge, will be astonished, as I myself was, to find earls and viscounts, deans and dignitaries, judges, &c., calling upon me, and bishops desirous to see me. Invitations to dinner were numerous from different quarters: one had been sent even to London, and to Cambridge, to engage us to dinner on the Bible-day. . . . In the morning of the next day I

[1] Indeed, he seemed to dread it. He writes to J. J. Gurney, who had just published a learned book, to warn him that it may "become a snare and rob the soul while it is furnishing the mind": *Life of Gurney* i. 432.

preached at St George's Church, to a congregation of 1200, a kind of preparatory sermon for the Jews; and God seemed to be manifestly present with us. In the evening I preached at another smaller church in the outskirts of the city; and had reason to hope that the word did not go forth in vain. On the next day (Monday) I dined at the Countess of Westmeath's and met Judge Daly and many other characters of the highest respectability. Tuesday was the Jews' Society day. This Society in Ireland takes the lead, and is carried on with surprising spirit. Their committee meets every Monday morning; and they give themselves to prayer as well as to the ministry of the various other offices that are called for.

"The Archbishop of Tuam was in the chair; we met in the Rotunda. It is, however, ill-adapted for speaking. The windows were open on both sides, so that the voice was carried out by the wind, and those in front could not hear; I did my best, however; but not without suffering for it for two or three days. They looked to me as the representative of the Society, and therefore I felt bound to exert myself to the uttermost."

It was not only in Ireland that he was now welcomed by the leading people in the country. He writes a little later: "We went to the meeting at Gloucester. The bishop in the chair. The meeting was very respectably attended. It was a good meeting; but not so holy as that at Bristol. After dinner I had hours of conversation with the Duchess of Beaufort and Mrs Whitmore. About thirty persons had been invited to tea, but they chose to have me to themselves, and glad should I be if I could record the conversation. Ladies in their station have a very difficult path to move in; and to act wisely in it is of infinite importance. My object was to lead them into all those nice discriminations which the Apostolic writings contain and which constitute true practical wisdom. . . . ." And he found the same loving reception when in France. He writes: "Lady William took me in her carriage to the Duke de Broglie's. The duchess understands English well, and has both written a preface

to Mr. Erskine's[1] book on the Evidences of Christianity and translated his book on Faith. I had a great deal of conversation with her. She has a strong aversion to Calvinism, and a strong persuasion that the heathen shall be saved; because it would be contrary to all that God has done for the salvation of the world, to punish those to whom that salvation has not been revealed. I opened to her my views of the Scripture system, as far broader than either Calvin or Arminius made it; and I showed her that brokenness of heart was the key to the whole. She is a lovely woman and very sensible. Her mother, Madame de Staël, has no reason to be ashamed of such a daughter"[2].

Simeon seems to have remained quite unspoilt by the surprising change in his position. To him every soul was just a poor weak struggling sinful existence which needed the omnipotent grace of God. He did not allow the admiration expressed for him to give him any idea of personal importance. The change he witnessed and in which he rejoiced was to his mind the perfectly natural result of the presence and the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit.

And this makes his thankfulness all the more outspoken. So he writes: "For many years after I began my ministry I was a man wondered at, by reason of the paucity of those who showed any regard for true religion. But now on my open days (Fridays), when I receive visitors at tea, frequently more than forty (all without invitation) come. What an honour is this! How impossible would it have been for me ever to have obtained it, if I had sought it! But God gives it me unsought."

Again: "In the month of April I was proposed as a member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; and as it was apprehended that I might be black-balled (for some have been who were far less notorious than myself), there went a host of bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, with their friends (about ninety or one hundred in all), to beat down opposition, and to vote me in with a high

[1] Erskine of Linlathen, see his *Life*.
[2] Carus, *Life of Simeon*.

hand. I understand there were but three opponents; and that Dr —— was peculiarly zealous in my support. Is not this of the Lord?"

Again: "Last week three bishops did me the honour of visiting me: Dr Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, Dr Law, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr Jebb, Bishop of Limerick; and I accompanied them to King's Chapel, and to Trinity Library, and spent above an hour with them; this shows how much Christian liberality has increased, and is increasing. I am not conscious that I am one atom less faithful to my God than in former days, or more desirous of human favour; yet God is pleased thus graciously to honour me. In former years I should as soon have expected a visit from three crowned heads as from three persons wearing a mitre, not because there was any want of condescension in them, but because my religious character affixed a stigma to my name. I thank God that I receive this honour as from Him, and am pleased with it no further than as it indicates an increasing regard for religion amongst my superiors in the Church, and may tend to lessen prejudice amongst those to whom the report of it may come"[1].

The quiet work at King's week by week, at Holy Trinity Sunday by Sunday, still went forward. He was seldom absent, though he was in such great request throughout the country. Here lay the stronghold of the Evangelical party. Here was the battle-field for real spiritual victory. Every undergraduate who could be trained in the devout school which he founded, would go forth as an officer commissioned to raise a new regiment for Jesus Christ. Each seed sown would multiply a hundredfold, a thousandfold perhaps, in the congregations which would be taught. He would trust to no one else, till God summoned him home, the particular post in Christ's Church in which he had been set.

One difficulty for the Simeonite system should be pointed out. The English Church claimed to be the Church of the nation. The incumbent of the parish is and was considered to be the pastor of all the people. But by the Simeonite

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon.*

system the inner circle, the true Church of the followers of Jesus Christ, was composed only of those who had passed through the ordeal of conversion, as they understood conversion. Could a practice of religion so severe, and one which exacted from its votaries not only a very deep experience of the spiritual life, but also a stern self-denial of many ordinary pleasures which were usually considered harmless, satisfy the religious needs of the whole nation? The Simeonite system provided depth in faith. How would it commend itself to the great mass of mankind unable to receive so strict and high a standard, yet craving for such spiritual teaching and such a moral standard as they felt it possible to reconcile with their daily avocations? Here the want of the two other schools of religious thought was sure to be most practically felt. Henry Venn's passionate preaching failed conspicuously among the rustics of Yelling, who were quite unable to follow his lofty experience [1].

One doctrinal note will be of interest. He writes in 1820: "We are no more disposed to detract from the honour of the sacred ordinance of Baptism than our adversaries themselves; we admit, and beg you to bear in mind our admission, that great, exceeding great, benefit accrues to the soul from baptism. In many instances, where the ordinance is really attended upon in faith, and prayer is offered up to God in faith, we do believe that God bestows a peculiar blessing on the child; and, though we cannot ascertain that He does so but by the fruits that are afterwards produced, yet are we warranted from Scripture to believe that the effectual fervent prayer of righteous people shall not go forth in vain; and that, 'whatsoever we ask, believing, we shall receive.' But even from the ordinance itself we may consider great good as arising to the soul; since, as in the case of circumcision, the person is thereby brought into covenant with God. The Israelites, as a nation in covenant with God, were highly privileged; for 'to them,' as the apostle says, 'belonged the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' The

[1] Vaughan, *Life of Robinson* 253.

same, I doubt not, may be justly said of all that are baptized: indeed, we doubt not but that our Reformers had that very passage of Scripture in their eye, when in our baptismal service they instructed us to thank God for having regenerated the baptized persons by His Holy Spirit; and, in our Catechism, to speak of children as by the ordinance of baptism 'made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.' These expressions are doubtless strong; and so are St Paul's expressions respecting the benefits of circumcision; and every blessing which he asserts to have been conveyed by circumcision, we may safely and truly apply to baptism. By the very admission of persons into covenant with God, they are brought into a *new state*, have a *right and title* to all these privileges; and by the exercise of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ they come to the actual possession of them.

"But the chief source of the fore-mentioned error is, that men do not distinguish between a change of *state* and a change of *nature*. Baptism is, as we have just shown, a change of *state*: for by it we become entitled to all the blessings of the new covenant; but it is not a change of *nature*. A change of nature *may* be communicated at the time that the ordinance is administered; but the ordinance itself does not communicate it now, any more than in the apostolic age"[1]. There is a curious mistiness of doctrine here, blended with a very firm belief in the real efficacy of Baptism.

And now I will exhibit the old man to you, as his disciples saw him: laughing a little at his eccentricities and loving him all the more, the more they laughed over them; for he was so very human. They knew the reality of the man who, as a true Greatheart, had guarded them through many assaults and dangers by the way. Here is the account of what he was at Cambridge, written by one of them:

"The report may have reached you, that Mr Simeon was in the habit of receiving at his rooms, on Friday evenings, those members of the University who might be desirous of profiting by his valuable instructions. Such practical or

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon* 380–1.

critical difficulties as had been met with during the preceding week, in the course of private study, or in social intercourse with Christian brethren, were brought by us gownsmen to the Friday evening tea-party to be propounded to Mr Simeon: and although I fear that in some instances, those who were present abused the privilege afforded us, and asked 'foolish and vain questions,' for the purpose of displaying their own wit and cleverness of parts, and, perhaps, with the mean hope of being able to say, 'I have puzzled Mr Simeon'; yet much do I err in judgment if many will not have occasion to praise God with eternal praises for benefits received at those important and instructive meetings.

"I must bring you, then, into Mr Simeon's audience-chamber, where my mind's eye sees him seated on a high chair at the right-hand side of the fire-place. Before him are the benches, arranged for the occasion, occupied by his visitors. Even the window-recesses are furnished with seats, which, however, are usually filled the last, notwithstanding the repeated assurances of our venerated friend, somewhat humorously expressed, that he has taken special pains to make the windows air-tight, and has even put the artist's skill to the test with a lighted candle. 'I shall be very glad,' he would say, 'to catch from you every cold that you catch from the draught of my windows.'

"At the entry of each gownsman he would advance towards the opening door, with all that suavity and politeness which you know he possessed in a remarkable degree, and would cordially tender his hand, smiling and bowing with the accomplished manners of a courtier; and I assure you we deemed it no small honour to have had a hearty shake of the hand, and a kind expression of the looks from that good old man.

"If any stranger was introduced to him at these meetings, he would forthwith produce his little pocket memorandum-book, and enter, with due ceremony, the name of his new acquaintance, taking care to inquire his college, and such other matters as he deemed worthy of being registered. Sometimes, too, he would comment, in his own way, upon the name he was writing, or make some passing quaint remark, which would put us all into a good humour.

"As soon as the ceremony of introduction was concluded, Mr Simeon would take possession of his accustomed elevated seat, and would commence the business of the evening. I see him, even now, with his hands folded upon his knees, his head turned a little to one side, his visage solemn and com-

posed, and his whole deportment such as to command attention and respect. After a pause, he would encourage us to propose our doubts, addressing us in slow, and soft, and measured accents:—'Now, if you have any question to ask, I shall be happy to hear it, and to give what assistance I can.' Presently one, and then another, would venture with his interrogatories, each being emboldened by the preceding inquirer, till our backwardness and reserve were entirely removed. In the meantime, two waiters would be handing the tea to the company: a part of the entertainment which the most of us could well have dispensed with, as it somewhat interrupted the evening's proceedings; but it was most kindly provided by our dear friend, who was always very considerate of our comfort and ease."

In 1826 Simeon was sixty-seven; one long illness, hindering him constantly from work for ten years, had left him a stronger man than ever; ten more years of continual toil still lay before him. He dwelt to the end in his quiet rooms at King's—rejecting every offer of a large income, and perhaps out of respect untroubled by proposals of high preferment from the leaders of the land. Pitt and Wilberforce, Canning and Peel had no desire of titles for themselves; their names are ennobled by their achievements. Simeon had a like dignity of personal power. "As to Simeon," writes Macaulay to his sisters, "if you knew what his authority and influence were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway over the Church was far greater than that of any Primate."

No one asks whether Francis Xavier or John Henry Newman were cardinals, or whether John Fletcher of Madeley or Charles Simeon were bishops. Such men reign through the centuries by the lustre of their every-day names. And though the King, William IV, sent for Simeon and gave him a special reception; though the bishops turned naturally to him for advice, and though the University thronged to hear him in the pulpit of St Mary's, never did any one think of taking him from his place in Cambridge, or suppose that office could add to his influence. In the University town, from the pulpit, by discussion classes, by quiet lectures in his own rooms, he

was training a generation of zealous clergy, to whom preaching the Cross of Christ seemed to require the sacrifice of all else, and to necessitate the most diligent exercise and cultivation of such talents as God had given them, in the voice and the gestures, in the style and the language. To these valuable embellishments of God's ambassadors Simeon often bade his students give heed, careful that the poor earthen vessel which displayed the light should be made, in its own perishable nature, as beautiful as skill could fashion it. These men understood, as they listened to the white-haired, gentle, courteous old man, who had declined wealth again and again, and still possessed nothing but his Fellowship and his tiny income from Trinity Church—that the love of Christ was everything and greatness in the world nothing: and that the only choice for them lay between the perils and loneliness of the missionary life, and the yet harder, wearier fight against the ignorance and sin of great cities at home. The powers were failing, but the man himself remained an inspiration. The physical forces wasted, but the worn-out body seemed only the more transparently to let the vivid light of the heavenly vision shine through its thin envelope.

Death came to him at last very tenderly. In September 1836, he said to a friend in conversation, "I find it difficult to realize the thought that I am so near the eternal world. I cannot imagine what a spirit is; I have no conception of it. But I rejoice in the thought that my coffin is already cut down and in the town at this very time, of this I have no doubt; and my shroud is also ready, and in a few days I shall join the company of the redeemed above." Even then he was busy preparing a course of University sermons to be delivered when his turn came in November.

The very next day he caught a severe cold, rallied for a little, then sank again, and his strength ebbed away. Words came slowly as the days went on, but always full of brightness. "Infinite wisdom has arranged the whole with infinite love, and infinite power enables me to rest upon that love." "I have the sweetest peace. I cannot have more peace. But if I look another way—to the poor creature—O then

there is nothing—nothing, but what is to be abhorred and mourned over." It was the delight of his close friends to be allowed to watch him; the spiritual life was so strong and so beautiful. "Nothing could exceed the calmness and dignity of his spirit and manner." But when too many crowded in, he asked them to leave him. "You want to see what is called a dying scene. That I abhor from my inmost soul. I wish to be alone with my God—the lowest of the low." "Jesus Christ is all in all to my soul." "My principles were not founded on fancies or enthusiasm, there is a reality in them, and I find them sufficient to support me in death." On Sunday, November 13, as St Mary's bell called its hearers to the University sermon in the afternoon, the sermon he should have been preaching, he passed out of this life peacefully to God.

Saturday, November 19, 1836, was the day fixed for Simeon's funeral, and the town joined with the University in honouring the faithful parish priest and mighty leader in Israel, whose body was laid to rest in the Chapel of King's College. "More than 1500 gownsmen attended to honour the man who had been greatly despised." Two appreciations will best close this story.

The first is from the pen of the spiritual teacher[1] who, more than any other, has worn Simeon's mantle and inherited Simeon's inspiration at Cambridge.

"Were I about to lecture I think I should be disposed to emphasize:

"1. The *personal* significance of his story: as he was an example of definite conversion and its power, as he exemplified all along after conversion the grand fact that its true issue is a life of indefatigable duty and service—and, where needful, of patient endurance. I should emphasize his noble combination of the Spirit's *fire* with a total absence of undisciplined, erratic thought and action. I should point out the testimony to the power of the truth of the Atoning Sacrifice given by Charles Simeon's faith and life from first to last.

[1] Bishop Moule of Durham.

"2. The Church of England significance of his story. How entirely, all along, he found that his new life in the Spirit had a delightful congenial home and room in the worship and order of the Church (while he never narrowly identified it with 'the blessed company of the faithful'). His new joy and peace (like Wesley's) found food *at once* in the worship of the Prayer Book, with its wealth of Scripture"[1].

The second is by the eloquent historian of the movement, Sir James Stephen, himself a listener.

"The Church of Holy Trinity at Cambridge, every Sunday, during more than half a century, witnessed the gathering of a crowd which hung on the lips of the preacher, as men hearken to some unexpected intelligence of a deep but ever-varying interest. Faces pale with study or furrowed by bodily labour, eyes failing with age or yet undimmed by sorrow, were bent toward him with a gaze, of which (with whatever other meaning it might be combined) fixed attention was the predominant character. Towards the close of that long period, the pulpit of St Mary's was, occasionally, the centre of the same attraction, and with a still more impressive result. For there were critics in theology, and critics in style and manner, and critics in gastronomy, thronging and pressing on each other, as once on Mars' Hill, to hear what this babbler might say; listening with the same curiosity, and adjudicating on what they had heard, in very much the same spirit. . . . His argumentation might occasionally irritate the understanding, his illustrations wound the taste, and his discourses provoke the smiles of his audience. But when, as was his wont, he insisted on fundamental truths, or enforced the great duties of life, or detected the treacheries of the heart, or traced the march of retributive justice, or caught and echoed the compassionate accents in which the Father of mercies addresses his erring children, it was a voice which penetrated and subdued the very soul. It was an eloquence which silenced criticism. It was instinct with a contagious intensity of belief. It sounded as the language of one to whom the mysteries and futurities of which he

[1] Letter from Bishop Moule.

spoke had been disclosed in actual vision, and so disclosed as to have dissipated every frivolous thought, and calmed every turbid emotion. If the Church of England were not in bondage with her children to certain Acts of Parliament, she would ere now have had a religious order of the Simeonites; and would have turned out of her catalogue some of her saints of equivocal character, and some of doubtful existence, to make room for St Charles of Cambridge" [1].

[1] Stephen, *op. cit.* ii. 371–3.

XI

HENRY PHILLPOTTS

1778–1869

BY

EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, D.D.

VICAR OF LEEDS

HENRY PHILLPOTTS

It was in the year 1855 that the reading public was convulsed with laughter over the description of the three sons of the venerable Archdeacon Grantley, given by a young and almost unknown writer who had never spoken to an ecclesiastical dignitary in his life. The description occurs in a novel which proved to be the earliest of a series destined to become famous for their admirable sketches of life in a quiet cathedral city. Dr Grantley's three boys were called respectively Charles James, Henry, and Samuel, and in the spirited sketches of these three schoolboys no one could help recognizing that the author had most audaciously represented the three most prominent figures upon the Episcopal bench in the middle of the nineteenth century. With the description of the eldest, Charles James, the "exact and careful boy" who "never committed himself," we are not here concerned, nor have we to do with the youngest, Samuel, or "dear little Soapy," as he was familiarly called. But the elaborate portrait of the second son, the Archdeacon's favourite, must serve as our starting point in this lecture on Henry Phillpotts, for, whether or no it is a true representation of the man himself, it certainly pourtrays him with wonderful fidelity as he was in the estimation of his contemporaries.

"Henry," we are told, "was indeed a brilliant boy. The versatility of his genius was surprising, and the visitors at Plumstead Episcopi were often amazed at the marvellous manner in which he would, when called on, adapt his capacity to apparently most uncongenial pursuits. He appeared once before a large circle as Luther the reformer, and delighted

them with the perfect manner in which he assumed the character; and within three days he again astonished them by acting the part of a Capuchin friar to the very life. For this last exploit his father gave him a golden guinea, and his brothers said the reward had been promised beforehand in the event of the performance being successful. He was also sent on a tour into Devonshire, a treat which the lad was most anxious of enjoying. His father's friends there, however, did not appreciate his talents, and sad accounts were sent home of the perversity of his nature. He was a most courageous lad, game to the backbone. It was soon known, both at home where he lived, and within some miles of Barchester Cathedral, and also at Westminster, where he was at school, that young Henry could box well, and would never own himself beat; other boys would fight while they had a leg to stand on, but he would fight with no leg at all. Those backing him would sometimes think him crushed by the weight of blows, and faint with the loss of blood, and his friends would endeavour to withdraw him from the contest; but no, Henry never gave in, was never weary of the battle. The ring was the only element in which he seemed to enjoy himself; and while other boys were happy in the number of their friends, he rejoiced most in the multitude of his foes. His relations could not but admire his pluck, but they sometimes were forced to regret that he was inclined to be a bully; and those not so partial to him as his father was, observed with pain that, though he could fawn to the masters and the archdeacon's friends, he was imperious and masterful to the servants and poor"[1].

Such is the portrait of Henry of Exeter, the immediate predecessor in that See of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, as he appeared to a not unkindly onlooker in the middle of the century. We are now able to judge more dispassionately of him, and to see that the strictures made upon his conduct were not always fair; but on the whole it must be admitted that there is a good deal of truth in Trollope's picture; and certainly the characteristic which is

[1] A. Trollope, *The Warden* ch. viii.

most prominent in it, viz. his readiness to do battle, for whatever cause appeared to him just, is that which took the largest place in the eyes of the public throughout his career. He was a fighter from his earliest days, not only in the wordy warfare of pamphlets, letters, and rejoinders, but also in the very expensive luxury of ecclesiastical litigation. He was always ready to have recourse to the law courts upon the slightest provocation. Indeed, shortly before his death it was publicly stated by his son that during his long episcopate he had spent no less a sum than between £20,000 and £30,000 in litigation. It is curious too to find that the fact that no complete life of him exists is really due to this readiness to appeal to the law courts, for a *Life and Times of Bishop Phillpotts* was not only announced in his lifetime, but the first volume actually appeared in 1863. It came, however, to an abrupt termination, because the Bishop in characteristic fashion appealed to the law, and procured an injunction prohibiting the writer, the Rev. A. N. Shutte, from publishing any of his letters. Materials for his life have, in consequence of this, to be gathered as best they may from various sources; and though for the controversial side of it there is no lack of material, yet it is to be regretted that so few of his letters have been made public[1], and that there is no connected account of his life as a whole. An attempt must, however, now be made to give from such sources as are available a sketch of his prolonged career.

Born in 1778, Henry Phillpotts only died in 1869, being as has already been remarked, succeeded in his See by the

[1] The few that have been published only serve to make us wish for more. In the *Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon* there is an interesting account of a visit of a pastoral nature paid to him shortly before his death by Bishop Phillpotts, together with a letter which the bishop wrote to him subsequently to press upon him the necessity of fixing his hopes exclusively upon the merits of our Saviour (iii. 295). Still more striking are two letters written to the Duke of Wellington in 1832 on his spiritual condition, warning him against the dangers of his exalted position, and urging him to attendance at Church. These, together with the duke's reply to the former of them, are given in *The Duke of Wellington's Correspondence and Memoranda*, edited by his son (viii. 145 f.). Other letters from the bishop to the duke will be found on pp. 35 and 488 of the same volume.

present Archbishop of Canterbury. It is difficult to realize that little more than thirty years ago there was still living among us as Bishop of Exeter and Canon of Durham the last of the pluralist bishops, a man who was born in the year after the American declaration of independence was made, and four years before the war was closed and the independence of the United States acknowledged by the mother country,—who was an intelligent boy at the time of the fall of the Bastille and the French Revolution,—who had taken his degree at Oxford before the eighteenth century was over, and who was actually raised to the Episcopate before the first Reform Bill was passed or the Tractarian movement had begun[1]. All this must be borne in mind in judging him. He belonged in many ways to the eighteenth rather than the nineteenth century, and though he might have been a disturbing element in the peaceful days of dullness and dignity which we associate with the Church of the Georgian era, yet he would have been quite at home among the noisy Churchmen of an earlier period in the days of Anne, and would have delighted to join the fray with Atterbury or Swift or Sacheverell.

From Bridgwater, where he was born, his father moved in 1782 to Gloucester, where for some years he kept the Bell Inn, an inn already famous for its association with the early years of George Whitefield. From the cathedral school at Gloucester Phillpotts passed "in shirt frills and a boy's jacket" at the age of thirteen or fourteen to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, the college at which, some fifteen years later, John Keble won his scholarship at about the same early age. In 1795 he took his B.A. Degree, winning in the same year the Chancellor's prize for an essay on the influence of religious principle. Shortly afterwards he was elected Fellow of Magdalen on the Somerset foundation. This success practically settled his career, for it brought him under the

[1] Bishop Sumner of Winchester, who resigned his See at the time of Phillpotts's death and survived him by six years, had been raised to the Episcopate before him, but was more than ten years his junior in age. He had held the Deanery of St Paul's *in commendam* with the Bishopric of Llandaff for a year in 1826–7, but had resigned it on his translation to Winchester in the following year.

influence of Dr Routh, who had become President of the College in the same year in which young Phillpotts matriculated. To Routh's advice it was due that he began to study theology, especially the works of the early fathers and of standard Anglican divines, and that he shortly afterwards took Holy Orders; and from Routh he learnt his sturdy and uncompromising Churchmanship, removed as far from Rome on the one hand as it was from Puritanism on the other. After his ordination he had not long to wait for preferment, for, probably through the influence of Lord Eldon, whose niece he had married, he was very soon presented to the Crown living of Kilmersdon near Bath. Those were the days of non-residence and pluralities, and Phillpotts never resided at Kilmersdon, nor did he think it necessary to resign it at once when two years later (in 1805) he was appointed, also by the Crown, to the Rectory of Stainton-le-street. Other offers of preferment were made to him in rapid succession. In the same year in which he became Rector of Stainton-le-street he refused the Principalship of Magdalen Hall[1], Oxford, and about the same time he was introduced by Dr Routh to Shute Barrington, then Bishop of Durham, who made him his chaplain in 1806. He was next presented by the Crown to Bishop Middleham in Durham, where he resided for two years, holding it *in commendam* with Stainton, but resigning his west-country living of Kilmersdon. Two years later he became Rector of Gateshead and Prebendary of Durham. In 1810 he accepted the living of St Margaret's, Durham, and in 1815 his prebendal stall (the ninth) was exchanged for a still richer one (the second), which, however, he resigned when in 1820 he became Rector of Stanhope, probably the richest living in England[2], the parish where nearly a hundred years before Joseph Butler had ridden about as rector on his black pony, always riding very fast, and had been so pestered with beggars that to get

[1] Now Hertford College.

[2] In good years it is said that the value of the living actually reached £7,000. The present Rectory was built by Phillpotts, who is said to have expended £12,000 on it and the grounds.

rid of them he often returned without completing his ride [1]. Before his appointment to this living Phillpotts had begun to make his mark as a controversialist. He entered the field as early as 1806, when he defended his Bishop against the strictures of an anonymous Roman Catholic opponent, now known to have been the historian Lingard. More important were the controversies of 1819–21, in which he appeared as a Tory pamphleteer, and did good service to his party, more especially by the famous *Letter to Lord Grey* in 1819. This was called forth by a speech of the Whig statesman in moving the second reading of a bill for repealing the test against popery, which then excluded Roman Catholics from office. The pamphlet at once attracted attention, and showed the leaders of the Tory party that in the person of the rising "clergyman of the diocese of Durham," as he signed himself, they had secured a man who had the courage of his convictions, and was not afraid to attack the most exalted of their opponents. Other controversies of this time in which Phillpotts engaged may be passed over without notice here, save for the remark that in the controversy with Jeffrey, the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, who made a furious attack upon him in connexion with the unhappy circumstances attending the Queen's death, the future bishop gave as good as he got, and "displayed a power of invective equal to, if not exceeding, that of Dean Swift" [2].

The *Letters to Charles Butler*, published in 1825, concern us more, and deserve more than a passing mention here, for the work is even now not without its value as a criticism of popular Romanism. Butler was a Roman Catholic layman, belonging to the 'ultra Gallican' school, who in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church* had done his best to minimize those tenets of the Church of Rome which were especially obnoxious to the popular Protestantism of the day; it being at that time a part of the settled policy of those who were advocating

[1] These were all the vestiges of tradition of his great predecessor that Phillpotts was able to discover during his residence at Stanhope. See Fitzgerald's *Life of Butler*, prefixed to his edition of the *Analogy*, p. xxviii.

[2] Perry, *History of the English Church* iii. 162.

the claims of the Roman Church to civic and political freedom to "represent the creed and the discipline of the Church of Rome as nearly in accordance with those of the established church"[1]. Thus attempts were freely made to represent in the mildest possible light, and indeed almost to explain away, the Tridentine decrees and the teaching of the Roman Church on Transubstantiation, and such subjects as those dealt with in our Twenty-second Article, viz. Purgatory, Pardons, Adoration of Images and Relics, and Invocation of Saints; and it appeared to Phillpotts that "so much of management" had "been successfully employed to distort or disguise the truth" that it was no longer "a superfluous task to revive in the members of our own Church a recollection of the real nature of those tenets, from which our forefathers at the Reformation were enabled by God's blessing to rescue themselves and their descendants"[2]. In order to do this he set himself to bring out the *practical* character of the Roman system, and made it his business to prove in a series of masterly letters that Roman teaching on all these subjects was not the innocent and harmless thing which writers like Butler and Milner made it out to be, and that their Church was really responsible for a good deal more than they were prepared to admit. Incidentally also he found it necessary to correct what appeared to him to be "a very erroneous statement, in some respects, of the doctrine"[3] of the Church of England, and thus the work has an historical interest as exhibiting the teaching of a High Churchman of the days before the Tractarian movement on the subject of Confession and Absolution, and on the Eucharistic Presence. The letters, like everything that Phillpotts wrote, are learned and acute; but they differ from most of his writings in one particular. As a rule his publications must have been most exasperating to his opponents, but in these letters there is much less than usual intended to irritate: and it is said that Butler was so impressed with a sense of their fairness and courtesy that he sought an introduction to the writer, with whom he remained on friendly terms until his death.

[1] *Letters to Charles Butler* 9. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. p. 4.

From the work just described, in which the *theological* questions between the Churches of England and Rome were discussed, Phillpotts presently returned to the *political* questions still agitating the country; and in 1827 published two "stinging"[1] letters to Canning, which had an immense effect upon the country. In the words of the *Times*, in an obituary notice, which did him tardy justice, they "woke up the nation to the great danger of conceding the Roman Catholic claims without exacting from that body adequate securities," but, as the *Times* adds, they also "woke the nation up to a belief that adequate securities could be suggested and might be obtained." The remark is a just one, and I cannot think that Phillpotts is fairly open to the charges so freely made against him, when two years later he supported Peel at Oxford, on that minister offering himself for re-election upon the introduction of the great measure of Roman Catholic relief. Before ever the ministers were converted to the necessity of the measure, he had really made it perfectly clear that he was only averse to granting concessions *without ample securities*; so soon as what he considered "ample securities" were taken his objections disappeared. His action, however, on this occasion was furiously resented by those who had looked on him as their great champion in resisting the Roman Catholic claims, and exposed him to the utmost obloquy; and when, the year after the Roman Catholic Relief Bill had been carried, it was announced that the Dean of Chester (a post to which he had been appointed in 1828[2]) was nominated to the See of Exeter, their rage and indignation knew no bounds. No words were too bad for him. His was "the most shameless apostasy on record." He was "a political Judas," an "arch-apostate, a polemical weathercock," "the betrayer of his religion," a "worldly parson, and rat," a "turncoat and vile recusant to Protestantism," a "whited sepulchre," and a

[1] This is Canning's own word.

[2] Some years before this he had refused the Irish See of Clogher, at that time worth £14,000 a year.

"gluttonous renegade"[1]. At a time when political feeling was running very high, and when men's passions were wildly excited, it was perhaps not unnatural that the appointment should be taken as a reward for the manner in which he was supposed to have "wheeled to the right about as if by military command." When, however, shortly after taking his seat in the House of Lords, the charge was brought against him by his old opponent Lord Grey, Phillpotts was able to appeal to the Duke of Wellington, who said straight out that the appointment was made "in spite of, not because of, his opinions on the Catholic question."

The See of Exeter was at that time worth only £2,700, and when the offer was made to him, Phillpotts stipulated that if he accepted it, he should be allowed to retain the living of Stanhope, which he had continued to hold with the Deanery of Chester. No difficulty was made by the Duke of Wellington's Government, but considerable opposition was raised by the parishioners, though curiously enough three of his predecessors had all held the living with bishoprics[2]; and before Phillpotts was consecrated the Tory Government had given place to a Whig one with Lord Grey at the head of it. The new prime minister may be pardoned if he felt a touch of malicious pleasure in listening to the remonstrances of the parishioners, and in refusing to permit the arrangement to be carried out. In the end, however, a compromise was effected, though not before Phillpotts had written a most powerful letter threatening to expose the conduct of the Government and to appeal to the public to judge between it and him. Under this threat it was, if Greville is to be trusted, that Lord Grey gave way[3], and consented to an exchange whereby

[1] These choice specimens of Billingsgate are all culled from a single article on "Dr Phillpotts the Bishop," in *Fraser's Magazine* for January, 1831. When exception is taken to the character of Phillpotts's language, the licence which his opponents claimed in abusing him ought in common fairness to be borne in mind.

[2] Butler had held it with Bristol, Keene with Chester, and Thurlow with Lincoln: so Phillpotts had plenty of precedents to go by in making his request.

[3] Greville, *Memoirs* ii. 100.

the Rector of Stanhope on vacating his living became once more the holder of a stall in Durham Cathedral, a stall which he retained *in commendam* with the Bishopric until the end of his life. These difficulties being thus disposed of, Phillpotts was consecrated Bishop of Exeter on January 2, 1831.

Thus began an Episcopate of nearly forty years, for the first thirty of which "Henry of Exeter" was one of the most prominent figures upon the bench. The subject of countless stories, always amusing, not always edifying; restlessly active in enforcing discipline; in lawsuits innumerable; a prolific writer of letters and pamphlets; a constant astonishment to onlookers; compelling an unwilling admiration from those who liked him least by the vigour of his utterances and actions; exasperating more often than winning over his foes; and not seldom embarrassing his friends by utterances which they could scarcely defend, and by his championship of causes which had been better left alone. He has been compared to Becket and Laud; but, though he would have stood up for the ecclesiastical immunities with Becket, and cried "salvo ordine nostro" with his latest breath, and with Laud would have enforced obedience to the rubrics through the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission, yet he hardly takes his place in the first line along with the greatest of Ecclesiastical Statesmen such as these. The ecclesiastics with whom he may more fitly be compared are those of the second rank, men in whom the *legal* mind is predominant, such as Stephen Gardiner, or Archbishop Sheldon. These are his real precursors.

He had scarcely taken his seat in the House of Lords before he made himself felt there. Those were the days of the agitation for the Reform Bill, and he shared to the full in the unpopularity of the bishops in consequence of their opposition to the bill[1], in the debate on which he crossed swords with Lord Grey and Lord Durham, the former of whom in moving the

[1] He was, however, himself under the impression that in his diocese generally, with the exception of Plymouth, he enjoyed "a very high degree of popular favour." See his letter to the Duke of Wellington in the Duke's *Correspondence* viii. 35.

second reading of the bill, so far forgot himself as to threaten the bishops, and bid them "set their houses in order," an expression for which the Bishop fiercely took him to task [1]. Against the bill Phillpotts made more than one brilliant speech, and after it had passed its second reading, he availed himself of the privilege belonging to the House of Lords, and attached his name to the Duke of Wellington's protest against it. He was an uncompromising opponent of the policy of the Whig Government with regard to the Irish Church, of the Act which created the Ecclesiastical Commission, of the Ecclesiastical Discipline Bill of 1838, as well as of the Act for the Commutation of Tithes, and of the Jerusalem bishopric; and, although in theory opposed to pluralities, he was never afraid of opposing any suggestions for their abolition, or of arguing for them as of great practical benefit to the Church. "The Rupert of Ecclesiastical debate"—the title given to him by the *Times*—is one which he fairly earned by the brilliancy of his onslaughts, and the number of lost causes which he championed. In the Hampden controversy he took a leading part, and among his many trenchant letters there are few more trenchant than that which he addressed to Bishop Wilberforce when that prelate suddenly changed his line of action, and withdrew from the case, declining to proceed in his opposition to the nominee of the Crown [2]. Of the first University Commission in 1850 he was, as might be expected, a determined opponent, and wrote a "thundering letter" [3] to the Commissioners, in which he boldly announced his intention of doing everything in his power to thwart their action, and to support the college of which he was visitor in its resistance to them.

Of the energy with which, until his health failed, he administered his diocese there is no room for doubt, though one may regret that he ruled by fear rather than by love. Still, it must be remembered that in many cases strong measures were absolutely necessary if he was to deal effectively

[1] See Molesworth, *History of England* i. 164, 174 seq.

[2] The letter may be read in the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* i. 489.

[3] The expression is Archbishop Tait's: see his *Life* i. 161.

with the disreputable and hard-drinking parsons, of whom there must have been only too many in the lonely villages of Exmoor and Dartmoor, and the out-of-the-way Cornish districts which made up so large a part of his diocese. Parson Trulliber was not yet extinct when he was appointed Bishop: and there were men of an even worse type than his. Readers of Blackmore's *Maid of Sker* will not have forgotten "Parson Chowne," and his remarkable exploit of breaking up the road that led to his parsonage, and filling a huge hole in it with bog-water in order that he might enjoy the spectacle of seeing the Bishop with his carriage and pair flounder into it when he came to visit him. It is said that the story is a true one, and that Phillpotts was the bishop to be so treated: and if Trullibers and Chownes were common, no wonder that he felt that the only way to deal with such men was by bringing the strong arm of the law to bear upon them, wherever that was possible [1]. There is, however, nothing to be gained now by enumerating his various lawsuits, for it would be a grievous injustice to imagine that his whole time was taken up with litigation, and that he did nothing but hunt out lax and unprincipled clergymen, to whom throughout his career he made himself a terror [2]. In the first year of his Episcopate he managed to visit Cornwall and the Scilly Isles, and his triennial charges form a most interesting record of diocesan

[1] Some stories of the disgraceful treatment which the Bishop met with at the hands of these men may be found in the *Memoirs of the Rev. John Russell* 93, and Baring-Gould's *Life of R. S. Hawker* 168.

[2] One of the most interesting of his lawsuits was that known as the "Berry Pomeroy Case," in which a Mr Shore, whose licence the Bishop had withdrawn, tried to escape from his jurisdiction by qualifying as a dissenting minister, and registering his chapel as a dissenting place of worship. The Bishop at once applied to the law, and was successful in court after court, Shore being imprisoned for refusing to pay the costs. On another occasion he consulted Cardinal Manning when he was set at defiance by a refractory priest, whom he was unable to dislodge from his church and benefice; and when Manning told him that the Church of Rome had a ready remedy for a priest who disobeys his bishop, "we suspend him *a divinis* by withdrawing the 'faculties' given him on taking charge of a mission," his reply was an expression of his envy of the Church of Rome "for its possession of such an effective weapon."—Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning* ii. 692.

administration. They show the zeal with which he worked for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, his earnestness in pressing on the clergy the claims of the National Society and the importance of the provision of schools, as well as the value of the long neglected practice of public catechizing. They exhibit him as a curious mixture of the old and the new. At one moment we find him defending with amazing courage some flagrant abuse, or objecting to some obviously desirable reform, and at the next moment his utterances show him as a man well in advance of his time, a pioneer in the introduction of schemes and movements which in the course of the last fifty years have almost revolutionized the Church of England.

A few of these deserve especial mention.

Our theological colleges for the training of graduates are nearly all the creation of the latter half of the century. Only two date from before 1850, Wells and Chichester, founded respectively in 1840 and 1839. Their foundation is, however, foreshadowed in the Bishop's earliest charge delivered in 1833, in which he writes as follows: "It might be practicable and expedient to append to the Chapter an institution in the nature of a school of theology, at which candidates for Orders might be required to reside during one or two years after they have left the University, and immediately before their ordination, thus acquiring the knowledge necessary for their holy vocation, and giving testimony of their fitness for it, by their previous conduct under the immediate eye of the bishop, or of those who are best able to judge and to report on it to him." Nor was the Bishop content with a simple expression of opinion, for some years later (in 1861) he actually founded such a college at Exeter, himself endowing it with a munificent benefaction of £10,000, a sum which since the closing of the college in 1867 has gone to the creation of the "Exeter Theological Students" fund, administered by the Dean and Chapter, from which grants are made to graduates intending to work in the diocese of Exeter or Truro, in order to enable them to continue their studies at the University.

The increase of the Episcopate is another subject which

only came prominently forward in the second half of the century. It is true that the Sees of Ripon and Manchester were founded in 1836 and 1845, but in neither case was there any intention of adding to the number of bishops, for when Ripon was founded Bristol was united to Gloucester, and the foundation of Manchester was intended to be accompanied by the suppression (happily in the event frustrated) of one of the Welsh Sees. But in his charge of 1842 we find the Bishop boldly advocating an increase of the Episcopate, and foreshadowing what became an accomplished fact eight years after his death, viz. the division of his huge diocese and the creation of a Cornish See, for which he had offered to surrender £1,000 a year of his income. Indeed it was owing to his forethought that a fifth Canonry was retained for Exeter, in order that its endowments might some day be transferred (as they have been) to the Cornish See. He also prophetically indicated the Rectory of Kenwyn as the future residence of the bishop, and left the bulk of his library as a legacy for the clergy of Cornwall[1].

Again, the Bishop was one of the earliest to realize the necessity for the Church to make a special effort to provide for the wants of the rapidly growing populations of our large towns. Very early in his Episcopate the spiritual destitution of the "three towns," Plymouth, Devonport, and Stonehouse, attracted his attention. He spoke of it at length in his charge of 1845, and shortly afterwards a scheme of Church extension was launched to which he contributed very liberally. This led to developments which no one could have anticipated, for Miss Sellon—one of many whose spiritual life had been quickened by the Tractarian movement—happened to read an appeal put forth by him on New Year's Day, 1848, for four large churches, additional endowments for the clergy, and "schools on an ample scale and in large number," and on reading it she was led to offer herself for work in the three towns in connexion with it. Her offer was accepted, and in due course there followed the establishment of the sisterhood known as the Devonport Society. The story of

[1] See the *Life of Archbishop Benson* i. 424, 427.

the movement belongs more properly to the *Life of Dr Pusey*, Miss Sellon's guide and adviser, where it may be read at length[1]. But it cannot be passed over without notice here, for the Bishop, after seeing the wonderful work which Miss Sellon and her colleagues had initiated, gave his hearty sanction to a community of sisters to carry it on, and himself became the official visitor of the society. It was not long before he was called on to act. Protestant prejudice was aroused. A violent attack was made upon the sisterhood, and the most absurd charges were flung at random against it. This necessitated a formal inquiry held by the Bishop, which led to his courageous championship of the unpopular side, and to his support of Miss Sellon through thick and thin. "The bishop," writes Dr Pusey, "has done nobly"[2], and it is certainly difficult to over-estimate the debt which the Church owes to him for his courage in this crisis. Had he flinched and bowed to the storm, the whole cause would have been thrown back indefinitely, and it is doubtful whether the Anglican Church might not have lost altogether the splendid devotion and service which has since then endeared the name of sisterhoods to thousands.

Once more, in some form or other, Diocesan Conferences and Synods are practically universal to-day. But they were unknown in the first half of the nineteenth century; and it ought not to be forgotten that the first Anglican bishop in modern times to brave the wrath of the lawyers, and, in spite of the threats of pains and penalties, to summon and hold a diocesan synod, was Henry Phillpotts. The occasion was given by the distress caused by the Gorham judgement, of which more presently; and the idea appears to have been due to a suggestion of Keble's passed on to the Bishop by Pusey[3]. This was warmly taken up by the Bishop, and the synod of his clergy met at Exeter in 1851, "to consider the fitness of making a declaration of firm adherence to the great article of the creed, 'I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins,' and to discuss matters of practical con-

[1] See the *Life of Dr Pusey* iii. 192 seq.
[2] Ibid. p. 199. [3] Ibid. p. 226.

cern to the diocese." Amongst these are the diocesan training college and inspectors, catechizing, pastoral superintendence of the young who have left school, lay work, more frequent services, and the observance of holy days; and it is interesting to find included among them *the permanent diaconate,* a subject which has since then been often discussed, in regard to which the Bishop stated his readiness to ordain non-academic persons to the diaconate, on the understanding that they should never be admitted to the priesthood unless they had obtained a University degree[1]. From time to time he thus ordained a few schoolmasters and others on these terms, and among them was Edward Steere, whose London degree the Bishop characteristically ignored altogether, so that the future Bishop of Central Africa was compelled to seek a curacy in another diocese before he could obtain ordination to the priesthood[2].

Of the Bishop's doctrinal position and his relation to the Tractarian movement something must now be said. As has already been pointed out, he learnt his theology from Dr Routh, and had taken up a position as a distinct High-Churchman before ever the Oxford Movement began. His charge of 1836, when the movement was still in its early days, is an outspoken utterance, in which he strongly urges his clergy to preach the doctrines of the visible Church, of baptismal regeneration, of the reality of absolution, and of the Eucharistic sacrifice, "the commemorative sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, in which the action and suffering of our Great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its head in heaven; Christ in heaven presenting the sacrifice and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously, the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtues and merits

[1] See *Act of the Diocesan Synod of Exeter*, 1851.

[2] See the *Life of Bishop Steere* 44 seq. Phillpotts would, it appears, have ordained him priest had he remained longer in his diocese.

of that sacrifice which it thus exhibits"[1]. This portion of his charge dwelling on these various doctrines of the Church, he afterwards expanded in a series of sermons preached in different parts of his diocese, which made an immense impression[2]. With the leaders of the movement his relations were friendly rather than intimate. Newman met him several times in 1835, and found him "exceedingly gracious"[3]. To Pusey he was invariably "very courteous"[4]. He showed his generous courage by allowing him to preach in his diocese during his suspension from the University pulpit, and by accepting the dedication of the sermons so preached, declaring himself "honoured" by having his name associated with them[5]. And when the excitement caused by the Papal aggression was at its height, and the prejudice aroused against Pusey greater than at any other time, he writes to him as follows: "Pray come to my house freely. I will not submit to the humiliation of not receiving gladly a friend whom I so highly value, because of the unjust clamours which ignorant or malicious persons may raise"[6]. But except just at the time of the Gorham controversy he never seems to have had any really close relations with any of the Tractarian leaders, and then only with Pusey, whom he consulted at every step. Towards the movement itself he adopted an independent attitude, never quite identifying himself with it; nor did he shrink from criticizing it freely. Thus in his charge of 1839 he regrets the advocacy of "the dangerous practice of prayer for the dead" by the Tracts for the Times, and in that of 1842 he speaks in very severe terms of Tract XC; but at the same time in both of these charges he boldly says that the Church is deeply indebted to

[1] With this should be compared what he says on the same subject in his Pastoral Letter of 1851. "Although once for all offered, that sacrifice, be it remembered, is ever living and continuous; made to be continuous by the resurrection of our Lord. Accordingly St John tells us in Rev. v. 6, 12, that 'he beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne stood a Lamb as it had been slain,'" continually presenting Himself before God as the one propitiation that—not *took*—but "*taketh* away the sins of the world."

[2] Newman, *Letters* i. 222.

[3] Ibid. 139.

[4] *Life of Dr Pusey* ii. 400.

[5] Ibid. p. 401.

[6] Ibid. iii. 293.

the Tracts, which have contributed "not to revive, for it was never dead, but to strengthen a practical sense of our *corporate* character, and of the necessity and efficacy of sacraments." How far he was himself influenced by the Tracts it is hard to determine. Possibly more than he was aware of, for though his position was in the main fixed long before the movement began, and his churchmanship was independent of it, yet in some points his teaching certainly advanced as years passed. Thus in his letters to Butler, written in 1825, while he unhesitatingly proclaims his belief in the real Presence, he directly limits it to the heart of the faithful recipient[1], whereas in his Pastoral Letter of 1851 he distinctly declines so to limit it; and when Pusey published his *Doctrine of the real Presence as contained in the Fathers* in 1855, he cordially approved of the work, and wrote of it as a "well-sustained and triumphant statement of the doctrine of the Church"[2]. Moreover, his defence of "auricular confession" in the Pastoral Letter just referred to seems to go a good deal beyond what he had written to Butler twenty-six years before, and here too we may probably trace the influence of Tractarian teaching.

With the desire to promote obedience to the rubrics and to introduce a more orderly and reverent ritual, which was fostered by the movement and followed in its wake, he was in fullest sympathy. It commended itself entirely to his legal and orderly mind. His Pastoral Letter of 1844 "on the observance of the rubric," and his charges of 1839, 1842, and 1845 all deal with the subject. The attempt, however, to enforce the use of the surplice in preaching, and of the offertory, was not immediately successful. It roused the

[1] "The Church of Rome holds that the body and blood of Christ are present under the accidents of bread and wine; the Church of England holds that their real presence is in the *Soul of the Communicant* at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper": *Letters to Charles Butler* 235.

[2] See *Life of Dr Pusey* iii. 433. He also told Pusey in 1844, with regard to the University sermon on the Eucharist for which the Doctor had been suspended, that he "saw nothing to censure" in the sermon, and that he thought he himself "differed in expression, but expression only" from Pusey: *Life* ii. 400.

most absurd and childish opposition, and led to the miserable "surplice riots" at Exeter, the precursors of similar riots at St Barnabas, Pimlico some years later, as these in their turn were the precursors of the yet more miserable scenes in St George's in the East in 1859 and 1860. Exeter was thus almost the earliest diocese to be confronted with the ritual difficulty, and the troubles and disturbances which arose from this cause at Torquay, Plymouth, and other places added to those in the Cathedral city, made a lasting impression on the Bishop, for when—nearly twenty years later—the subject of ritualism was before the public again, it drew from him in a bishops' meeting the following characteristic remark: "if you try to enforce the rubric you will have a rebellion: try to alter it, and you will cause a shipwreck" [1].

And now, what is to be said of the great controversy through which the Bishop is most widely known to-day? Everybody has heard of the Gorham judgement, and of the Bishop's famous protest in which he renounced communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury; but the details of the tangled story are largely forgotten now. Only the briefest outline can be given here. It was in 1847 that the controversy began, when the Rev. George Cornelius Gorham was presented by the Lord Chancellor (Lord Cottenham) to the living of Bramford Speke in the diocese of Exeter. So far back as 1811 Gorham had narrowly escaped being refused ordination by Bishop Dampier of Ely because of the unsoundness of his views on baptismal regeneration, though Phillpotts, who had always been especially insistent on the reality of baptismal grace, apparently raised no objection when called on to institute him to the living of St Just in Penwith in 1836. He now, however, took a different line, and claimed his right to examine him before instituting him to the benefice to which he was nominated. For eight days the examination lasted, and at the close the bishop declined to institute on the ground that Mr Gorham denied the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. To this day it is a matter of some uncertainty what the precise views held by Gorham

[1] *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* iii. 193.

really were; nor need we here inquire, for there is no doubt that the Bishop had entirely satisfied himself that he did not believe that spiritual regeneration was given or conferred in baptism. In this he was supported by the Court of Arches, to which Gorham appealed, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust giving judgement (Aug. 2, 1849) in favour of the Bishop's refusal to institute, on the ground that Gorham had definitely opposed the teaching of the Church of England on baptismal regeneration. An appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council at once followed[1], and finally on March 8, 1850, a decision was given against the Bishop on the ground that Gorham's opinions were "not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established," and that therefore he "ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admission to the Vicarage of Bramford Speke." To this decision the Archbishops of Canterbury (Sumner) and York (Musgrave) were consenting parties: not so the Bishop of London (Blomfield). Of the six actual (lay) judges, Vice-Chancellor Knight Bruce alone dissented. The Bishop was not the man tamely to acquiesce; and among all his writings none is more trenchant than the extraordinarily powerful letter which, within a fortnight after the delivery of the judgement, he addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Deep conviction and common sense, trenchant logic and indignant irony are brought to bear with triumphant effect on the judgement of the Judicial Committee"[2], and the Bishop ends with a solemn protest against the Archbishop giving mission to exercise cure of

[1] It will be remembered that the old Court of Delegates had been destroyed, and its powers had been transferred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by Lord Brougham's legislation of 1832 and 1833, and that Brougham himself said that the Court was never framed with the expectation of ecclesiastical cases being brought before it, and he had "no doubt that if it had been constituted with a view to such cases as the present [the Gorham case], some other arrangement would have been made." Cf. also Bishop Stubbs's Historical Appendix to the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission* 51. An interesting account of the actual method of forming the Court in the Gorham case is given by Greville, who was himself clerk to the Privy Council: *Memoirs* vi. 307.

[2] *Life of Dr Pusey* iii. 229.

souls within his diocese to a clergyman who proclaims himself to hold the heresies which Mr Gorham holds. "I protest," he writes, "that anyone who gives him mission till he retract is a favourer and supporter of those heresies. I protest in conclusion that I cannot without sin, and by God's grace I will not, hold communion with him, be he who he may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears." Of this repudiation of communion with him by his fiery suffragan the gentle Archbishop took no public notice; but it is said that he wrote him a private note which drew from the Bishop the exclamation, "I have received a letter from the Archbishop which is not the letter of a man, but of an angel" [1]. Whatever may be the truth of this, it did not deter the Bishop from repeating his protest, and delivering it under his hand and episcopal seal, declaring publicly not only that "any archbishop or bishop or official who shall institute the said George Cornelius Gorham will thereby incur the sin of supporting and favouring the said heretical doctrines," but also that he did "hereby renounce and repudiate all communion with anyone, be he who he may, who shall so institute the said George Cornelius Gorham." In spite of it all, however, when the Bishop's applications to the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer, for their interference had successively failed, institution was at last given by the judge of the Archbishop's Court on the fiat of the Archbishop, and Gorham secured his living, and held it till his death in 1857 [2]. The wisdom of the Bishop's action in originally declining to institute was questioned at the time by some of those who were the strongest maintainers of baptismal grace, and notably by Dr Pusey, who thought that Gorham might have been won by kindness, but that he would only be exasperated by law [3]; but when once

[1] See the *Life of Bishop C. R. Sumner* 334.

[2] When Gorham was actually instituted the Bishop wrote to the Churchwardens of the parish, telling them that they must submit, but that they should at once bring to his knowledge any instance of heresy being preached by their new Incumbent. It should be added that he bore no ill-will to Gorham personally, and subscribed to the restoration of the Church.

[3] *Life of Dr Pusey* iii. 204.

the case had begun, both he and Keble were among the Bishop's staunchest supporters, and Pusey was the most trusted of his advisers, so that at this time the Bishop drew nearer to the Tractarian leaders than he had ever done before. The immediate results of the controversy were disastrous to the Church, not only on account of the fierce passions and bitter animosities that were aroused on either side, but also from the number of secessions to Rome—including those of Archdeacons Manning and Wilberforce, and William Maskell, the Bishop's own Chaplain—which followed on the judgement. These were due not only to the fact that it was (wrongly, as we can now see) imagined that the Church was committed by it to a denial of sacramental grace, but also to the most unsatisfactory nature of the court of final appeal, to which men's eyes were now for the first time opened. The unsatisfactory character of the court unfortunately remains to-day, and is still a standing difficulty. But as regards the doctrine of baptism there can be little doubt that the attention which was then drawn to the subject has led to a far wider recognition of the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer on the reality of the grace given in it. Archdeacon Wilberforce was perfectly right when he said in his charge to the clergy of the East Riding delivered shortly after the judgement that "the doctrine of baptismal grace may be considered to stand in a more favourable position in consequence of the very efforts which have been made to discredit it," for the truth for which the Bishop so earnestly contended is far more firmly established in the minds of Churchmen to-day in consequence of the battle which he fought. Whether the same results could have been gained without all the unhappy consequences which have been mentioned it is impossible now to determine. We can only note the fact that at least in this, through the Providence of God, the controversy has in the long run been overruled to the good of His Church.

Nor must another good result be overlooked, for the controversy "served to convince even the most timid and hesitating of Churchmen of the absolute necessity of reviving the action of the synods of the Church, and no longer leaving

her without a voice and power of expression, exposed to the attacks of her enemies"[1]. New force was immediately given to this agitation which had been steadily growing for some years previously, and the synod of Exeter prepared the way for the meeting of the synod of the province. In the autumn of the year in which the Gorham judgement was delivered a society for the revival of Convocation was formed with Henry Hoare as the chairman of its executive committee, and towards the close of 1852 the synod of the Province of Canterbury met for deliberation for the first time since its voice had been tyrannically silenced in 1717. That this revival of Convocation was mainly due to the untiring efforts of Samuel Wilberforce is undoubtedly the case; but among those who supported his action Henry Phillpotts, as was only natural, was one of the most prominent. He had advocated its revival in his charge of 1842, and when Convocation actually met, his voice was one of the most eloquent and powerful in supporting the Bishop of Salisbury's motion in favour of a declaration that "its legislative assemblies are an essential and most important part of the constitution of our reformed Church, and that the circumstances of the present day make it alike more imperative to preserve, and as far as possible to improve them."

The stormy years of the Gorham controversy and the revival of Convocation form the climax of the Bishop's career. The later "fifties" were, save for the London ritual troubles, times of comparative peace and quiet for the Church; and when more exciting times began again in the early "sixties" with the storm of indignation aroused by the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, and the South African troubles connected with Bishop Colenso, Phillpotts' health was already failing. He was able indeed to join with his brethren on the Episcopal bench in their condemnation of *Essays and Reviews*, but he was no longer capable of taking the leading part he had done of old. In 1862 he gave his last charge and made his last triennial visitation of his diocese. In the following year he spoke for the last time in the House of Lords, being then so infirm that he was allowed to

[1] Perry, *History of the English Church* iii. 291.

address the House from his seat. His intellectual powers were, however, still vigorous, though his nature was much softened, and was becoming gentler with age. Bishop Wilberforce, who had noted some years before that "only the velvet of his paws" was to be felt [1], found him "shrewd as ever" [2] in 1863, and in the following year received from him a most characteristic letter of hearty thanks for the famous castigation given to Lord Westbury in the House of Lords [3]. Indeed, so late as 1867, Wilberforce notes in his diary that he was "in full force intellectually" [4] and in fair health; and again "quite himself, but kinder; memory perfect and full of complaisance" [5], For some time "the old lion" had been "tamed" [6]; and when in 1869 the Act was passed empowering bishops to resign their Sees, he and Bishop Sumner were the first to signify their intention of taking advantage of it. Before, however, the necessary formalities were completed Henry Phillpotts had passed away, for he died at his house at Torquay [7] on September 19, 1869.

Such was the career of Henry of Exeter, one of the strangest figures in the history of the English Church. He certainly deserves to be commemorated in any series of Lectures on prominent English Churchmen, though it is difficult to know exactly where to place him. Thoroughly independent, he took his own line, regardless of others, and was "nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri." He could never be quite reckoned on by any party in the Church. And as he followed no leader himself, so he formed no party to follow him. Indeed he was lacking in the most essential gifts of a party leader. He stands by himself, a unique figure in the first half of the nineteenth century. He deserves to be honoured for his labours and sacrifices on behalf of the Church and its doctrines, and the courage with which he championed unpopular causes:

[1] *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* ii. 279. [2] Ibid. iii. 121.
[3] Ibid. p. 145. [4] Ibid. p. 235. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.
[7] Connected with this place is one of the Bishop's characteristic sayings in which Bishop Wilberforce delighted. A lady to whom he was showing it bored him by indiscriminate praise. At last she said, "And it is so Swiss!" "Oh, very Swiss," said the Bishop, "only there are no mountains here, and there is no sea in Switzerland."—See *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* iii. 29.

but it must be confessed that the feeling which the study of his life leaves on the mind is one of admiration for his talents, and astonishment (not unmixed with amusement) at his exploits rather than of affection and love. It has been said that "an ounce of love is worth a pound of controversy"; and it is impossible to doubt that Phillpotts would have done more for the Church had he been more willing to try the effect of gentle measures and less ready to appeal at once to force. It is pleasant to remember that a gentler disposition came over him towards the last, and as one contrasts the quiet years towards the end of his life with the stormy days of his earlier career, there recur to the mind the words with which old Thomas Fuller ends his account of Wilfrid, which may well serve to conclude this sketch: "His life was like an April day, often interchangeably fair and foul, and after many alterations he set fair in full lustre at last."

XII

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

1805–1872

BY

WILLIAM EDWARD COLLINS, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

When the religious history of the nineteenth century comes to be written, its proportions will doubtless be very different from what would have been expected by those who lived in it. Events which seem critical enough to those who take part in them often dwindle into insignificance when seen in their true perspective; and the great lines of purpose which run through all human history, but are so easily lost sight of through prejudice or partisanship, begin to stand out more clearly as we look back over the past. The Church was not really in danger on every occasion when men thought that it was; each little point of practice or doctrinal expression was not, as it seemed, an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*; neither party so entirely embodied the whole truth as at the time it seemed to do. On the other hand, vast movements were in progress, bearing the signs of God's own handiwork, which it was easy to overlook simply because they "came not with observation." Events which then appeared to be of little significance are now seen to have been truly "critical points"; and things which, to those who lived amongst them, seemed to foreshadow the opening of the floodgates of evil, are now seen to have been truly the signs of the day of the Lord. It is only by the light of after days, and even then only by degrees and in part, that we can discern the true proportions of an age, or the true meaning of a great movement, or the true message of a life.

And thus, when the religious history of the nineteenth century comes to be written, the leaders of great parties

and schools of thought, the men who in their own age were most widely looked up to and followed, may not always occupy so large and important a place in it as we or they might expect. But however our estimates may be falsified by the judgement of posterity, there is one of whom it is safe to say that he must always stand out pre-eminently: Maurice the seer. During the greater part of his own lifetime, although greatly trusted and revered by an ever-widening circle of friends, he was about the most generally hated of all men in the religious world at large. To-day there are few names that are more generally honoured amongst us than his. This, however, supplies but a very partial measure of his influence. Nobody has done so much to leaven and broaden and deepen our whole spiritual outlook as he. Many elements of his teaching have been so generally assimilated amongst us that this very fact stands in the way of our realizing our debt to him: we neither know whence we derived them nor who it was who brought them forth, but assume that our fathers were as familiar with them as we are. On the other hand, it may be doubted whether we have yet begun to assimilate some of the most essential elements of his teaching.

It is no easy task to set forth, within the limits before us, what he was and what he did. We need to know both the man and his communication if we are really to see him as he is; neither would be complete without the other, and indeed the one cannot be separated from the other. He was what he was because of his message: on the other hand, his message was truly part of himself. It is not necessary for our purpose, however, to deal in any detail with the facts of his life. The story has been told with great skill and matchless fidelity by his eldest son, Major-General Sir J. F. Maurice, in what is one of the finest biographies in the English language[1]. Here we may see Maurice face to face as he was seen by those who were most dear to him; we are taken, as it were, into his confidence. He was a great letter-writer, and few have written more or wiser "Letters of Spiritual

[1] *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, chiefly told in his own letters.* Edited by his son, Frederick Maurice. Reference is here made to the fourth edition (1885).

Counsel" than he. In these letters, of which indeed the book largely consists, we are enabled to understand his inmost thoughts about each great question or movement as it arose, about every difficulty or doubt which perplexed men's minds during the very critical period in which he lived. To my mind they reveal both the man and his message not less clearly, perhaps even more clearly, than his more formal writings. In them we have both his first spontaneous thoughts, and also his "oral gospel," so to speak, as he delivered it over and over again, now in one way, now in another, to those who wrote to him or consulted him in their need [1].

I

John Frederick Denison Maurice, to give him for once his full name, was born on August 29, 1805, at Normanstone, near Lowestoft; and his childhood was spent for the most part there and at Frenchay, near Bristol. He was the fifth child of Michael and Priscilla Maurice, and his father was a minister of the old English Presbyterians who, in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, had drifted for the most part into unitarianism. Michael Maurice was a man of no little learning, a friend of Joseph Priestley the chemist, devout and earnest, and full of a large-hearted tolerance. For the rest, his unitarianism was not of the hard dogmatic type which has become commoner since his day, but of the old-fashioned kind which refused to be bound by any creed, and rejected the faith of the Church in the interests of a supposed liberalism in matters of thought. Such a position has generally had little of stability or permanence, and Michael Maurice had to bear the sorrow of seeing his family, one by one, desert the teaching in which they had been brought up by him. One of his daughters ultimately found rest in the Church of

[1] On the other hand his more formal writings can be neglected by no one who really desires to understand his teaching. Perhaps the following are the most important: *The Kingdom of Christ; Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy; Patriarchs and Lawgivers* and *Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament; The Doctrine of Sacrifice; Theological Essays;* and the beautiful expositions of *The Lord's Prayer* and *The Ten Commandments.*

England; two more became rigid Baptists; and at length the mother also became a strong Calvinist, and withdrew from the ministrations and the communion of her husband. He bore it all patiently, only stipulating that they should not use their influence with the younger children against him. But it left a weight of inevitable sadness upon the old man, which is clearly to be traced in the tender and loving letters which passed between him and his son in later years.

Such was the religious atmosphere in the midst of which Frederick Denison Maurice passed his boyhood. He received his early education from his father, but he was left scrupulously free in other ways, and his strongest religious impressions were naturally derived from his mother and his sisters. These, however, gave him little satisfaction; and the years of his boyhood were, as he afterwards wrote, "years of moral confusion and contradiction" [1]. It had been taken for granted that he would follow his father's profession; but after a while he expressed a desire to go to one of the Universities and to read for the Bar. Accordingly, in October 1823, he proceeded to Cambridge, where there were no tests at matriculation, and was entered at Trinity College, his tutor being Julius Charles Hare. Here his powers soon made themselves felt. Hare wrote, soon after his arrival, that there was in his class-room "a pupil whose metaphysical powers were among the greatest he had ever come in contact with, but that the man was so shy that it was almost impossible to know him" [2]. Nevertheless, he soon made many friends. Hare himself was one, who subsequently became his brother-in-law, for Maurice married Hare's sister as his second wife. Another was the brilliant and imaginative John Sterling, who became a great admirer of his, and described himself about this time, or a little later, as occupied in "picking up pebbles beside the ocean of Maurice's genius" [3]. Through him Maurice became known to others, and before long he found himself the acknowledged leader of a circle of young men which included all that

[1] *Life* i. 21; cf. i. 175, "I was much confused between the opposite opinions in our household."

[2] Ibid. i. 52.

[3] Ibid. i. 56.

was most notable in the University. Meanwhile, at the end of his second year, he had migrated to Trinity Hall the law college *par excellence*; he read law, and in due course passed the examinations for LL.B. degree, taking a First Class in Civil Law in 1826. "That," as he wrote afterwards, "seemed to be a reasonable preparation for a member of the Temple, and it entitled me to leave the University without any fuss about not professing myself a member of the Church of England"[1]. For, being still unable to sign the Articles, it was impossible for him actually to take the degree. His tutor, indeed, endeavoured to persuade him to keep his name on the books, in order that, should he see his way to sign the Articles within the next eighteen months, he might still take his degree and compete for a fellowship. But Maurice saw that this would really be placing a temptation in his own path, more especially as he already felt strongly drawn towards the English Church; so he refused to "hang a bribe around his neck to lead his conscience"[2], and took his name off the college books.

The next two years were spent in London, studying law and writing for the magazines, utilizing his knowledge of English literature, which was already very wide, and taking the keenest interest in questions and events of the day. For a time he edited the *Athenaeum* with John Sterling. He began writing a novel, *Eustace Conway*, of which, when it was published in 1834, a friend said that "if it had not had the most villanous plot that had ever been constructed, it would have been the best novel that had ever been written"[3]. But his life in London was not really happy, and he felt that he had not yet found his life-work. Meanwhile, his religious convictions were gaining in definiteness, and at length he announced his intention of seeking communion with the English Church, and returning to the University with a view to preparing for her ministry. Accordingly, in 1829 he became an undergraduate of Exeter College Oxford, entering the sister University with a great reputation, and there also making many friends. The following year he was baptized,

[1] *Life* i. 177. [2] Ibid. i. 73. [3] Ibid. i. 166.

his godfathers being William Jacobson, afterwards Bishop of Chester[1], and Sir Thomas Dyke Acland. In 1831 he took his degree with a Second Class in *literae humaniores*, and in 1834 he was ordained deacon.

From this point the bare facts of his life are soon told. From 1834 to 1836 he was curate in charge of Bubbenhall in Warwickshire; after which he held the chaplaincy of Guy's Hospital for ten years, a post which then involved the conducting of Sunday services, but little of the diligent spiritual care of the sick to which we are accustomed nowadays. In 1840 he became Professor of English Literature and History at King's College London; and subsequently, when a theological faculty was founded, he held also the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History, until he was expelled from both chairs in 1853. He was Boyle Lecturer in 1845 and Warburton Lecturer in 1846; and in the latter year he was appointed Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. In 1860 he was nominated by the Crown to the incumbency of St Peter's Vere Street; and six years afterwards he was elected Professor of Moral Philosophy and Casuistry at Cambridge, an office which he held till his death on Easter Monday, April 1, 1872, holding with it from December 1870 the vicarage of St Edward's at Cambridge, to which no emoluments were attached. In other words, the record of his life shows him to have been a diligent parish priest, a notable preacher, and a man of learning; but so far there is nothing to distinguish him greatly from other men.

II

Is it then his literary work to which he owed his greatness? was he pre-eminent as a scholar or a man of letters? Hardly so. It is true that he was a life-long student, of exemplary diligence and very wide range, and that he possessed in a remarkable degree the faculty of discerning the essential elements in whatever he studied and setting aside what was merely accidental or external. But he was not professedly or primarily a student or a writer. His style, beautiful as it

[1] Who had himself been brought up as a dissenter.

is, is often obscure [1], and has frequently served to conceal his true meaning from careless or superficial readers; and his published works, with the exception of the *Kingdom of Christ* and the *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, consist for the most part of sermons and other occasional writings [2]. And as I have said, his letters are sometimes a better vehicle for his teaching than his more formal works.

Nevertheless, the two books just named are in themselves remarkable enough to have made their writer famous, and it will be well here to give a word of description to each. The scope of the former is explained by its title, *The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints on the Principles, Ordinances and Constitution of the Catholic Church, in Letters to a Member of the Society of Friends.* It is, in a word, an attempt to set forth the principle of Catholicity as contrasted with that of separateness or puritanism: to show that the former, and not the latter, is the basal principle of the Christian society, and to indicate both where it is, and how men have really abandoned it when they have sought to build upon it for themselves [3]. The latter, the *Moral and Metaphysical*

[1] See Hort's criticism of his style in later days, *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* ii. 158.

[2] In a measure this is the case, it must be remembered, even with the *Theological Essays*. The book is the effort of a somewhat unsystematic, though not indefinite writer, a prophet rather than a dogmatic teacher, to put into writing his thoughts on certain points of doctrine, in their most pronounced form, in order that his theological opponents might not acquit him in ignorance of what he really thought. It cannot therefore be treated as being in any sense a manual of doctrine.

[3] The object of the book is well set forth in a passage in the Introductory Dialogue with which the book opens: "The early Quakers testified that there was a KINGDOM OF CHRIST in the world, and that it would subdue all kingdoms to itself. Are you willing to inquire with me into the grounds upon which they made this assertion; to consider whether those grounds be tenable; and whether the Quaker system be or be not the realization of the Quaker idea? Shall we then inquire into the principles of those religious bodies who wish you to reject Quakerism; asking whether these also may not be sound and true, and whether they have not been depraved and degraded by certain negative notions to which they have been appended; whether the systems which have been invented to express them, do really express them or no? Supposing our conclusions on this last point should not be satisfactory, shall we then proceed to consider the assertion of the Romanist—that there is a Catholic Church which existed before all these

Philosophy, began with an article, or articles, for the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, undertaken whilst he was at Bubbenhall, and occupied him at intervals nearly all his life, growing with his growth and ever receiving a deeper impress of his thought. It is not perhaps very widely read at the present time, but none the less it is a great and noble work which cannot be read without gain. Here as elsewhere he attempts to get through the husk to the kernel, to get down to the roots of a man's thought and to see what his real message was. No doubt this lays him open to one great danger: that of reading his own ideas into the writer whose thoughts he is endeavouring to explain. But on the other hand, it gives him a power of insight, simply because he measures men's thought by the only true measure: by no mere external or mechanical standard, but by "the spirit of man that is in him," which alone "knoweth the things of a man." In other words, it is an endeavour to do for the history of philosophy [1] what is being done for economics in the present day, by writers of the modern school who realize that the greatest of all the elements with which they are concerned, and that

systems, and which is derived from a higher authority than all of them? If he should be able to make this assertion good, we may then inquire whether the Romish system be this Church or the disease of it; whether that system have exalted the ordinances of the Church which its supporters acknowledge and revere, or have degraded them and deprived them of their significance; whether this Church Catholic be in contradiction to those ideas which the Quakers and other Protestant bodies hold, or whether it be the legitimate and perfect realization of them. We cannot complete this investigation without examining that point upon which your Romanist friend discovered so close a resemblance between your views and his; the point, I mean, whether a national society and a universal society be in their natures contradictory and incompatible; or whether they have been only made so by certain notions which interfere with the universality of the spiritual body as well as with the distinctness of the national body. When we have arrived at some conclusion upon this matter, we shall be in a condition to speak of our position in England; to inquire if there be a Catholic Church here or not, and if there be, under what circumstances it exists, what are its dangers and evils, whether these dangers and evils are reasons for our living in separation from it or for uniting ourselves more closely to it." *Op. cit.* i. 25 ff. (second edition, 1842).

[1] It was described as "rather a history of ethical ideas" by John Stuart Mill. (Mill to R. B. Fox, Sept. 9, 1842: *Memories of Old Friends*, by Caroline Fox, ed. by H. N. Pym, new edition, 1883, p. 433.)

which governs all else, is also the oldest of all: that which we know as human nature [1].

But great as these two works are, they do not in themselves reveal to us the secret of Maurice's greatness. He did not aspire to be a man of letters or a philosopher. Indeed, he had already definitely renounced the idea of the life of a professed student when he came to London; for he told a friend in or about 1835 "that a man who in that day was more desirous to serve God and his fellow-men than to win a name for himself, would give up the thought of producing any complete literary work, and employ himself in writing and teaching on the successive subjects on which the men of the day were thinking and endeavouring to reduce thought to action"; and his words implied that he had felt, but rejected, the allurements of that last infirmity of noble minds, the desire to win and leave a name for himself [2]. That is to say, he deliberately adopted the life of a practical teacher, because he had a message for men in their everyday life. He made it his object to help people to live rightly; and with this object in view he studied men, not things, or rather studied things for the sake of men. He aimed at bringing to others the light which had been given to him, because he held that it belonged to them also. He was pre-eminently a man with a message; and he never lost the consciousness of the fact. He was humble and self-forgetful beyond other men, he was ever conscious of his own failures and of his share in those of his brethren, he was by temperament despondent rather than hopeful, but God who had met him in the way and revealed Himself to him had filled him with hope, and the consciousness of a mission and a message never failed him [3].

[1] One has only to compare the older and the newer writers in order to observe the difference; but see in particular a striking paper by Professor Alfred Marshall on "The Old Generation of Economists and the New," in the Harvard *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for January, 1897.

[2] See an essay on Maurice by Marcus Dods, in *Erasmus and other Essays* 179.

[3] This is one of the many respects in which a parallel may be drawn between him and the saintly teacher who most resembled him in the next generation, Brooke Foss Westcott, Bishop of Durham.

III

And what then was his message? It was simply to proclaim that which he knew by his own experience. He had tested one after another the various notions of God into contact with which he had been brought, and had found them wanting. He had found that the Unitarian idea was not fulfilled by the Unitarian theories. He had felt the unsatisfactoriness of the Universalist conception of an easy-going God, good-natured yet far off, and having no real fellowship with His creatures. As little could he find rest in the harsh sovereignty of the Calvinistic system. On the other hand, he saw that men could have no real intellectual or spiritual apprehension of an absolute First Cause, unknown, far off, unconditioned. He saw, in fact, that man could never be satisfied with any mere notions of God, but that his nature craved for God Himself, and he saw the impossibility of our knowing God but by His revelation of Himself[1]. Thus he was led on to the realization that God "hath in these last days spoken unto us in His Son," and that to know this, and to respond to His call, is the highest thing for every man, and the all-essential. In the Faith, in fact, he found the realization of all that Unitarians seek: "I was bred," he wrote long after, "a Unitarian. To realize the meaning of the name of Father, the meaning of the Unity of God, is my calling and duty. I believe there cannot be a Father without an only-begotten-Son of the same substance with Himself, that there cannot be any Unity but the Unity of the Eternal Father with the Eternal Son in the Eternal Spirit. I am therefore constantly striving after the idea, the root, of the faith in which I was educated"[2].

Maurice has told the story of his spiritual enlightenment in a most remarkable letter to his father, written whilst he was at Oxford. "The whole of history," he says, "shows me that just as far as the True God has made Himself manifest, just

[1] This is nowhere more finely set forth than in a letter to Mr (afterwards Dr) F. J. A. Hort: *Life* ii. 15 f.

[2] *Life* ii. 515.

so far has there been light, truth and honesty in the world"; and "hence I feel that just so far as I can hold intercourse with Him, I can be true and honest to myself . . . thoroughly true and honest to myself I have no hopes of being, without this real personal knowledge of Him who is Truth. To attain to this truth, this heart truth—not to fancy that I have it, but to have it—is my greatest wish." And then he goes on:

"God, I am told, is a Spirit, and I am of the earth, earthy. I cannot, and would not if I could, abandon my belief that He is a lofty Spiritual Being; I cannot throw aside my own earthliness. Now, this seems to me the most important practical question in the world. I cannot put up with a dream in the place of God. He is a Spirit, but He is reality; He is Truth, a True Being in the highest sense. As such I must behold Him or not at all. To behold Him, therefore, in that way in which they could alone understand, in which they could converse with Him, namely, as a man, was, I see more and more clearly, the longing desire of every patriarch, prophet, and priest from Adam downward. It was the desire of Abraham, of Moses, of Job, of David, of Solomon, of Isaiah; they were practical men, and they wanted a practical revelation, a revelation which they could understand and grapple. God, they knew, must be for ever the Unsearchable, the Mysterious. They would not for worlds He should be anything else; for it was the glory of Judaism that their God was not a visible, intelligible idol, but an incomprehensible Spirit. Yet they longed to behold Him, and to behold Him so as they could understand Him. I would beseech you to observe attentively whether nearly every verse in the Old Testament does not exhibit these two apparently opposite and most contradictory feelings: an acknowledgement of God as incomprehensible and infinite; a desire to see, to understand, to comprehend that same God. Yes, and just so far as the heathen attained any light did they begin to make the same acknowledgement and feel the same want. . . . And if this be the one great cry of human nature in all ages, just in proportion as it was enlightened, then cannot any explanation be found for it except only that which will satisfy it. If the Infinite Incomprehensible Jehovah is manifested in the person of a Man, a Man conversing with us, living among us, entering into all our infirmities and temptations, and passing into all our conditions, it is satisfied; if not, it remains unsatisfied. Man is still dealing with an

incomprehensible Being, without any mode of comprehending Him. He may be revealed to him as his lawgiver, his sovereign, but he has no means of knowing Him as a friend."

And even this, Maurice goes on, was not all. The complete satisfying of all men's yearning could only be attained by that Man's passing through death and thus becoming an efficient Mediator for us, and also by His sending to us "the Spirit, who could be no other than the Spirit of Christ (otherwise there could be no intercourse between Christ and His disciples on earth through Him); and if the Spirit of Christ (supposing what was before said to be true), must be the Spirit of God; and if the Spirit of God, could not be an inferior part of God's nature, but must be His very Being, because He is a Spirit."

"This, my dearest father," he proceeds, "is my faith. . . . There may be a hundred thousand simpler faiths. It is simpler to believe in a Great Spirit with the North American Indians; it is simpler to worship wood and stone; but what is the worth of simplicity if it does not account for facts which we know, if it does not satisfy wants which we feel, if it does not lead up to the Truth which we desire?" [1]

It was this faith, moreover, which led him to the English Church. He became a Churchman, not because he liked the church system or approved of the opinions held by churchmen, but primarily because he felt that God, who was calling him and every man, must by that very call have constituted an universal society of which they were to be members. As he expressed it nearly thirty years afterwards, in the reply to an address which was presented to him when he was preferred by the Crown to St Philip's Regent Street:

"I took refuge in the Church of England, in which I had not been educated, because as I thought it offered me an altogether different bond of fraternity from [one based on similarity of opinions]. A society merely united in opinion had, it seemed to me, no real cohesion; it must exalt that which a man or a multitude troweth, above the truth, or

[1] *Life* i. 134 ff.

must suppose them identical. It will be very positive, yet it will have no permanent resting-place. It will be always changing, never growing. It will be alternately persecuting and Latitudinarian; it will be equally far from steady belief and genuine tolerance. The Church of England confesses a Father, who has revealed Himself in a Son; a Son, who took our nature and became Man, and has redeemed men to be His children; a Spirit who raises men to be spirits. She invites all to stand on that ground. She tells all—so I read her formularies—that they have no less right to claim their places in her as members of Christ than they have to claim their places in the nation as subjects of the Queen, and in their families as children of an earthly father and mother. This was a rock upon which I felt that I could rest. It was a foundation for a universal human society. If no such society existed, history seemed to me a hopeless riddle, human life very intolerable. If it did exist, it could not crush national life or family life, but it must cherish and sustain both. It could stifle no thought; it must thrive when it suffered persecution, grow weak whenever it inflicted persecution. It must be ready to embrace all persons. It could never seek to comprehend any sect. It must be the great instrument of healing the strife of classes within a nation. It must proclaim Christ as the Deliverer and Head of all nations"[1].

Such is the basis of his faith, and the substance of his message, all through his life; for although he grew continuously, there is a wonderful unity in his teaching. He affirms and bears witness to the absolute reality of God's dealings with all men, and their fellowship with Him. He affirms that righteousness and justice, goodness and love, must mean essentially the same thing when predicated of God as they do when predicated of men: not indeed that our conception of them is perfect, but that they themselves have their origin, and can have, in Him alone. He affirms, following St John[2], that "now are we children of God, and it is

[1] *Life* ii. 375.

[2] Many noticed his resemblance to the Apostle of Love. He was, said Charles Kingsley, "the man who, of all men whom I have ever seen, approached nearest to my conception of St John." An American clergyman who was present at his classes on St John's Gospel at the Working Men's College in 1855 or 1856, described it by saying that "it was St John expounding St John": *Life* ii. 555.

not yet made manifest what we shall be." And he believes and knows that these things are true and must be, simply because they and they alone correspond with all that we truly know; they and they alone answer to and satisfy the highest and deepest aspirations of men.

Naturally, to many who did not understand it, such a position laid him open to the charge that he based his creed upon men's intuitive perceptions, and thus robbed it of all objective reality. But such is not really the case. He does not base his creed upon any merely subjective criterion, but affirms that the Christian revelation supplies its own highest evidence, since it and it alone corresponds with all the facts of intuition and experience, and thus both correlates and interprets them. We may best illustrate his position by what he said at a later date with regard to the cardinal doctrine of the Resurrection:

"There is to me an overpowering evidence for the Resurrection in the concurrence of the testimony through all nature, and in my own being, that Death must have been overcome, that it cannot be my master as my downward inclination leads me to think it is—with the testimony of straightforward honest men 'We saw Him after He was risen, though we thought the thing too good to be true.' But their testimony without the other could not affect me. I must cast it aside, let those who spoke it have been ever so honest. God's testimony has made man's credible. And so the most civilized part of the world has become a Christendom, and its power of doing any of the works of civilization—of effecting any works which defy death and assume the victory of life—has been another testimony to the Resurrection, immeasurably stronger than the arguments of all divines and apologists" [1].

IV

The work of Maurice's life, then, was to assert these truths in season and out of season: to test everything by its agreement with or divergence from them as criteria: to set them

[1] Maurice to Kingsley, Aug. 11, 1863: *Life* ii. 450.

forth as the foundation and the basis of all life and all human activity: to see life and death and all things in their light. Most people will readily accept a great truth in words when it is presented to them, but then fall back upon their old rules of conduct, upon current doctrinal phrases and accepted methods of living. It is not so with Maurice. He aspired to "the grand title of a theologian"[1]; he believed that "theology is what our age is crying for, even when it thinks it is crying to be rid of theology"[2]. This living loving presence of God is the very foundation of all his thoughts: to him it is the key to all things. The *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, as he said, is "that God has claimed us all in Christ as His sons"[3]. His work, in other words, was to deliver man from phrases which had grown formal and formulas which had worn threadbare, and to lead them back to Christ; to bring them face to face once more with the primary facts of the Gospel. The great point about Maurice as a teacher is not that he had, or claimed to have, any occult message or new revelation for men, but that he had not. He endeavoured to make all men realize better what was, as he believed, already the inmost conviction of their hearts, simply because it was very Truth: viz. "that neither Scripture, nor conscience, nor church, nor holy see, deeply and profoundly as they may reverence one and all, would seem to them worth anything—the least comfort in their own sorrows, the least relief from the sense of misery and curse of the world—if they did not think that the living God was teaching them, and disciplining them, and holding converse with them"[4]. "I have affirmed continually," he wrote, "that I have discovered nothing; that what I am saying is to be found in every creed of the Catholic Church"[5]; and speaking of his message in its entirety it is certainly

[1] *Life* ii. 136. "The Kingdom of Heaven is to me," he says later on, "the great practical existing reality which is to renew the earth and make it a habitation for blessed spirits instead of for demons. To preach the Gospel of that Kingdom, the fact that it is amongst us and is not to be set up at all, is my calling and business": ibid. p. 137.

[2] Ibid. ii. 493.

[3] Ibid. ii. 357.

[4] *Epistle to the Hebrews* p. xxxvii, ed. 1846.

[5] *Doctrine of Sacrifice* p. x.

true [1]. This it is which makes him a great prophet [2], a great teacher of spiritual realities. His old tutor Julius Hare told Mr Llewelyn Davies that, in his belief, "no such mind as Maurice's had been given to the world since Plato's" [3]; and although Maurice has little of Plato's imaginative grace and his wonderful beauty of style, it is true that, both as regards spiritual discernment and philosophical depth Maurice deserves to be called a Christian Plato [4].

[1] It is this conviction on his part of the essential truth and completeness of the Christian revelation which laid him open to Mill's criticism. The passage must be quoted in full: "I have always thought that there was more intellectual power wasted in Maurice than in any other of my contemporaries. Few of them certainly have had so much to waste. Great powers of generalization, rare ingenuity and subtlety, and a wide perception of important and unobvious truths, served him not for putting something better into the place of the worthless heap of received opinions on the great subjects of thought, but for proving to his own mind that the Church of England had known everything from the first, and that all the truths on the ground of which the Church and orthodoxy have been attacked (many of which he saw as clearly as any one) are not only consistent with the Thirty-Nine Articles, but are better understood and expressed in those Articles than by any one who rejects them. I have never been able to find any other explanation of this than by attributing it to that timidity of conscience, combined with original sensitiveness of temperament, which has so often driven highly gifted men into Romanism from the need of a firmer support than they can find in the independent conclusions of their own judgement": Mill, *Autobiography* 153. Such a judgement is surely no more than a mere parody; but at least it bears testimony to Maurice's conviction of the reality of the revelation of God in Christ, as witnessed to by the Church in all ages.

[2] By many of those who looked upon themselves as his disciples he was familiarly known as "The Prophet": Lewis Campbell, *The Nationalization of the Universities* 62.

[3] R. H. Hutton, *Modern Guides of English Thought in Matters of Faith* 320.

[4] Elsewhere Hare records his opinion of Maurice in the following terms. In a letter dated Feb. 17, 1836, and written with a view to Maurice's appointment as permanent chaplain at Guy's Hospital, he says: "Of your intellectual qualifications the electors can hardly require any further witness than what is afforded by your pamphlet 'Subscription no Bondage.' At least I know no work comparable to it in reach and depth and power of philosophic thought produced by any minister of our Church within the last hundred years; and though my opinion on the immediate topic was and still is different from the one therein maintained, I never read a book which so compelled me to love and revere its author": *Life* i. 190. Later on, at the time of the King's College troubles, he wrote: "It is impossible to know Maurice, as I have done intimately for thirty years, without admiring and loving him; indeed, taking him altogether, his head and his heart, he is

And like a true philosopher and prophet, he learned from every source, not allowing himself to be carried away by that which was merely outward and accidental, but striving always to get at the true inwardness of every writer whom he studied. Like Origen [1], he had the great gift of being able to accept from teachers of the most diverse kinds whatever elements of good they had to offer, without either following them in every ramification of their teaching, or repudiating them on account of what he could not receive. The Fathers, the Schoolmen, later theologians and philosophers and poets, are all laid under contribution. There can be few who have studied with so catholic a mind as he.

In particular he had profited greatly by the teachings of two writers who were very generally distrusted, not to say scouted, by religious people of his day. The first of these is Samuel Taylor Coleridge, the great thinker who had followed out the current eighteenth-century philosophy of England and France to its inevitable conclusion in "the deadlock of Hume"; who had seen that "the same method which annihilates all philosophy except positivism will, if carried out consistently, in turn annihilate positivism itself, and reduce us to the old 'sophistical' denial of the possibility of affirming even phenomena" [2]; and who then, in part following Lessing and Schelling and Kant, had been led to vindicate the true place of intuition, and "to thrust down logic from its usurpation over all human thought," and to claim for all "the light which is common to all, and never can become the individual

incomparably the grandest example of human nature that it has ever been my happiness to know. . . . I do not believe that there is any other living man who has done anything at all approaching to what Maurice has effected, in reconciling the reason and conscience of the thoughtful men of our age to the faith of our Church. . . . I believe it is in great measure owing to him that the intellect of the rising generation is with us rather than against us. This arises not merely from his intellectual power, but from the moral grandeur which goes along with it and sanctifies it": ibid. i. 182 f.

S. Greg. Thaumat. *Orat. de Orig.* c. 14. Origen encouraged his pupils to study the philosophers and poets and other writers of every nation, the dogmatic atheists alone excepted.

[2] See Dr Hort's most valuable essay on Coleridge, in the *Cambridge Essays* for 1856, p. 317.

property of each"[1]. Maurice had learned much from him. "In him," he writes, "I seemed to see a writer who was feeling his way into the apprehension of many questions which had puzzled me, explaining to me his own progress out of the belief that all things are dependent upon association, into the acknowledgement of something with which they are associated"[2]. And again, it was Coleridge who "was most helpful in enabling me to perceive that the deepest principles of all are those which the Peasant is as capable of apprehending and entering into as the Schoolman"[3]. In fact, in early days, when Maurice and Sterling were working together in the Debating Society founded by John Stuart Mill and others, they are described by Mill as "the Coleridgians"[4]; and Maurice, although he never met him[5], never lost his deep reverence for the man who was at once a philosopher and "a penitent, who knew that though his crimes might be less than those of open reprobates, his sins were greater, and prayed, God be merciful to me"[6].

The other writer of his own day whose influence upon Maurice was most profound was Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, the Scottish advocate who became the apostle of a wider and truer faith than the current Calvinism. In his *Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel* he had vindicated the all-embracing largeness of God's mercy[7]: in *The Brazen Serpent* he had

[1] Hort's essay on Coleridge, p. 325 f.

[2] *Kingdom of Christ*, dedication to the second and later editions, p. xvi.

[3] Ibid. p. xviii.

[4] Mill, *Autobiography* 128; cf. *Life* i. 176.

[5] J. Dykes Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge* 268 n.

[6] *Life* ii. 194.

[7] Long extracts from this work and from that next referred to are given in the *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, edited by W. Hanna (third edition, 1878). "The Gospel reveals to us the existence of a fund of divine love containing in it a propitiation for all sins, and this fund is general to the whole race, every individual has a property in it, of the same kind that he has in the common light and air of the world which he appropriates and uses simply by opening his mouth or his eyes. Is it not clear that as soon as any one really knows that such a fund exists, and that it is indeed the gift of God to the world and the common property of all the individuals in the world, just as the natural air and light is, he will immediately infer his own particular interest in it, and enter into the enjoyment of it, and he will make the blessed discovery which no tongue can rightly describe, and

endeavoured to treat afresh the whole subject of Atonement, with especial reference to notions of substitution which were then widely current [1]. Maurice drank in such teaching eagerly, and never ceased to express his thankfulness to the teacher. And when in 1852 he published his *Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament*, the book was dedicated to Thomas Erskine, from whom, more than twenty years before, he had gained "the conviction that no gospel but" one which is truly a gospel for all men "can be of any use to the world, and that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is such an one." He goes on to say:

"Many of my conclusions may differ widely from those into which you have been led; I should be grieved to make you responsible for them. But if I have tried in these sermons to show that the story of the prophets and kings of the Old Testament is as directly applicable to the modern world as any Covenanter ever dreamed, but that it is applicable because it is a continual witness for a God of righteousness, not only against idolatry, but against that notion of a mere Sovereign Baal or Bel, which underlies all idolatry, all tyranny, all immorality, I may claim you as their spiritual progenitor" [2].

V

Naturally enough, those who endeavoured to treat a prophetic teacher like Maurice as though he were a dogmatic theologian, found that he did not answer to their expectations. There were elements of Christian teaching in which, almost inevitably, they found him lacking. He himself

no mere intelligence can rightly conceive, even that he himself has a possession, an inalienable, an everlasting possession in the heart of God?" (p. 544). See also the striking account of Erskine's discourse with Principal Shairp on justification, in the latter's *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy* 435 f.

[1] "When therefore it is said that Christ died or does things for us, it is not meant that He did or does them as our substitute, but as our Head. He does them for us as a root does things for the branches, or as a head or heart does things for the body": *Letters of Thomas Erskine* 551.

[2] *Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament* p. xi f. On the other hand Maurice was fully alive to the defects of Erskine's theology. See *Life* ii. 383.

realized that this was so, and wrote as follows, in a letter to his sister, of its true significance:

"I feel that I have been driven by the necessities of my own being to seek so much more for a present deliverance from cruel and pressing enemies, than for any future bliss, that the vision of the latter has often been almost entirely obscure to me. I am sure that this has been a grievous loss to myself, and has put me at a distance from many with whom I should wish to be in sympathy. But I am sure, also, that there is a deep reason why to particular persons particular portions of truth should be, for a while, in shadow. They may miss great comfort, but they are thereby shown what they especially are appointed to understand and proclaim. The blindness and ignorance is their own, but the illumination in the other direction is God's"[1].

Naturally also they failed who tried to claim him as the adherent of any particular school of churchmanship. (*a*) He has sometimes been spoken of as a Broad Churchman; and indeed in the article of W. J. Conybeare in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which the name was first invented[2], he is classed as one. But the fact is, and it cannot be too clearly stated, that he had nothing in common with Broad Churchmen, as the name was then and still is commonly understood; and he himself vigorously repudiated it:

"I do not know well what the Broad Church is. I always took it to be a fiction of Conybeare's. If it means anything, I suppose it is a representation, under different modifications, of that creed which is contained in Whately's books, or of that which has arisen at Oxford out of the reaction against Tractarianism. Now I must say that I would rather trust a living Book to the lowest Churchman who had imbibed any of his lore from Newton or Romaine, than to these accomplished and tolerant persons. Personally I have the greatest respect for them, so far as they protest against any cowardice or deceit in handling the Word of God, against any misrepresentations of sceptics [i. e. by orthodox persons], against any traditional hardness or formality; so far I am

[1] *Life* ii. 242.

[2] Lewis Campbell, *op. cit.* p. 70.

willing to bear any disgrace with them. But what seems to me the greatest disease of our time, that we talk about God and about our religion, and do not confess Him as a living God, Himself the redeemer of men in His Son, Himself the inspirer of all right thoughts, the guide unto all truth by His Spirit is characteristic of no school so much as this"[1].

No man could be less of a "Broad Churchman" than he; his son is right in saying that the name stood for "the denial of all for which he had striven in life"[2]. If he was extremely tolerant of the opinions of others, if as a teacher of others he was anxious that "an earnest and honest expression of opinion should not be checked"[3], however much he himself dissented from it, it was not because he held that the truth was either doubtful or vague. "I base toleration," he writes, "not upon the uncertainty of truth, but upon its certainty; not upon the absence of a revelation of it, but upon the existence of revelation and upon the promise that the Spirit of Truth shall guide us into the perception of it"[4].

(*b*) As little again, although he had much in common with them, could he be classed with Low Churchmen: in fact they were his bitterest and most unceasing opponents. He recognized indeed the element of truth in their Calvinism, "its proclamation of God as the originator of all faith and righteousness in man"[5], its witness to the Will of God as the underlying fact of the universe. He did full justice to their earnestness and sincerity, their realization of the Divine presence; but beyond this he has little in common with them. He repudiates the attempt to judge of the spiritual state of men from external criteria[6]; he affirms that the Will of God is towards us from the first, and not merely from the beginning of our conscious turning to Him;

[1] *Life* ii. 359. [2] Ibid. ii. 595.

[3] Ibid. ii. 104. "We can never get comfort," he writes elsewhere, "by hiding any fact": ii. 259.

[4] Ibid. ii. 385.

[5] Ibid. ii. 317, cf. 152. Compare a remarkable passage on the same subject from the conversations of Thomas Erskine, in Shairp, *op. cit.* p. 446.

[6] *Life* ii. 241 f.

he refuses to assume that the heathen are outside the covenant of God, since the Lord vouchsafed to take upon Him our nature; above all he rejects all theories which would either subordinate faith to feeling [1], or make our salvation dependent upon our belief instead of upon Him in whom we believe [2], or base the Christian society upon opinion instead of upon fellowship.

(*c*) There is much, very much, in such a man, with his large-hearted Catholicity and his strong sense of the reality of spiritual things, and his ever-present realization of God's personal dealings with men, to bring him into sympathy with the leaders of the Oxford Movement; with whom, indeed, in his earlier days, he came rather closely into contact. It would certainly be truer to class him with them than with either of the other parties. To him the Church was no mere concession to human frailty but of the very essence of things [3]; obedience to constituted authority and reverence for order were innate in him; he had the keenest sense of historical continuity. Nor was it only on the ground of common principles that his sympathies lay with them. He made his Communion very frequently and with great devotion [4]; the Eucharist he regarded as the centre of all Christian worship, "the very organon of scientific theology and of social life" [5]. He was regular in the saying of his daily offices; he kept all the fasts of the Church with scrupulous carefulness [6]. He was always ready and eager to defer to the directions of his bishop, whether or not they happened to agree with his own views;

[1] R. H. Hutton, *Modern Guides in Matters of Faith* 332, quotes Maurice as saying, "Faith first and feeling afterwards is, I believe, the rule which we are always trying to reverse."

[2] "What I lament in Evangelical teaching generally is . . . a disposition to make the sacrifice [of Christ] conditional upon our understanding of it": ibid. ii. 557.

[3] See *ante*, p. 338, and *Lincoln's Inn Sermons* vol. I, no. xvii: "The Atonement not only restores the union between men and God: it restores the union between men whom time and space had put asunder" (p. 257).

[4] There is a very remarkable letter on the subject in the *Life* ii. 393 f.

[5] Ibid. ii. 591.

[6] "In practice," writes his son, "he carried to an extreme point his own fasting on all the days prescribed by the Church": ibid. ii. 290.

his resistance to the Council of King's College was largely based upon the fact that an irresponsible body of clergymen and laymen were presuming to take upon themselves the office of a judge of the faith. His realization of the Communion of Saints was very vivid: "I believe," he writes, "that we are really surrounded by all that we have lost. I do not think we bring them to us by our thoughts and recollections, but that they are present with us, and that we should believe it more if we believed that God was with us"[1].

And yet it cannot be said that Maurice was in any sense a Tractarian. He broke with them when they seemed to him to be exalting points of practice into too great importance, or basing the idea of the Church upon views instead of upon facts, or doing what tended towards sectarianism instead of towards Catholicism. Above all, he definitely broke with them on the subject of Baptism. It appeared to him that, according to their teaching, Baptismal Regeneration implied a change of God's Will towards the infant, whilst he (laying quite as much stress upon it as they did) regarded it as the coming of the infant within the reach of a Light that had always been shining for it and all the world[2], the proclamation of that which was God's Will towards it from the first. It is easy to see now that the difference was not so profound as it seemed, since Baptism itself, the birth into the new Christ-life, is one stage in the operation of that Grace which has been manifested towards us from our first day until now. But there were undoubtedly single phrases in the writings of Tractarians which were capable of meaning that Baptism brought about a change of God's Will towards the child. This roused Maurice's most earnest indignation; and in his eagerness to refute it he laid yet greater emphasis upon the fact that Baptism itself is "grounded in the eternal relation of God to man in the living Word;" so much so, in fact, that on one occasion in explaining the words of the Catechism, "wherein I was made a member of Christ," &c., he must be said to have almost explained them away[3].

[1] *Life* ii. 63. [2] Ibid. i. 214.
[3] See the letter to Charles Kingsley, dated Oct. 26, 1855: *Life* ii. 271–5.

VI

None then could claim him as a member of their party. Still less, however, would he consent to make a party of his own, great though the forces were which would have compelled him to do so. Few men had a deeper personal influence, and few gathered more devoted friends and adherents around him than he did. The *Life* is full of instances of the way in which they sought to band themselves together under him as their leader, and of the way in which he continually held them back [1]. "I cannot enter a party," he says, "for the sake of compassing an end which involves the destruction of party" [2]. He was above all anxious not "to form a party which should inscribe 'no party' on its banners" [3]. We see the results to this day. A great teacher frequently leaves behind him those who call themselves by his name, but inherit little of his teaching, and indeed little but his fads and mannerisms. Certainly it would be hard to find any teacher of anything like the same influence who has so entirely avoided the formation of a school of this kind; and I venture to think that those who are most eager to claim the shelter of Maurice's great name are not always those who best represent his spirit.

But although he was not the leader of a party, he was all his life a leader of men; and this not only in the realm of thought, but of action. This also was the outcome of his message. "The deepest philosophy," he writes, "is that which lies under the business of life and explains it" [4]; and Maurice became a practical worker because he was a theologian. He was the means of founding Queen's College; he projected the series of *Tracts for Priests and People*; with his friends and disciples, Kingsley and Hughes and Ludlow and many more, he inaugurated the Working Men's College; above all, he became the leader of the Christian Socialists,

[1] The letters to that venerable friend of every good cause, Mr J. M. Ludlow, are especially remarkable in this respect.

[2] *Life* ii. 7. [3] Ibid. ii. 597. [4] Ibid. ii. 38.

as they called themselves[1], in a day when the word "socialism" was more abhorred than "anarchism" is now. And in all this, as would probably be acknowledged by most thinking men to-day, he did no more than attempt to apply the plainest Christian principles to everyday life. He found the then existing conditions of labour venerated as though they were sealed with the seal of the living God; he declared that they were besmirched with the marks of the devil. "Competition," he wrote to Kingsley, "is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time is come for us to declare that it is a lie by word and deed"[2]. So he and his friends set to work to protest, to educate, to set on foot co-operative methods instead of competitive. They were met with much abuse and misunderstanding; their experiments often failed, and very often proved futile; in some cases the associations which they were instrumental in forming came to grief through the dishonesty of their officials. But they persevered steadily: "The principle I think is sound," he says, "and will spread and bear fruit hereafter." The prediction may fairly be said to be justified already, more especially in the sense in which it was originally spoken. For Maurice did not mean to imply that they were bringing a new panacea into the world: quite the reverse. "He maintained that all the great work that has been achieved by society *in its existing form* has been achieved by the mutual co-operation of men, and that it has been where selfishness has intruded itself that rottenness and mischief have followed in its train"[3]. Here, as elsewhere, he held that the true principle needs not to be introduced into the world: it is there already, and our function is not to create it, but to proclaim it. And so, whilst he did all in his power to propagate true social principles with characteristic caution and far-seeing wisdom, he warned men of the danger of simply adding to the existing confusion by forming themselves into a sect of Christian Socialists[4].

[1] For the reasons for the choice of the title see *Life* ii. 35.
[2] Ibid. ii. 32. [3] Ibid. ii. 41. [4] Ibid. ii. 220.

VII

Naturally, such a man was frequently engaged in controversies. He was so, indeed, almost of set purpose. He never attacked the unpopular side, whatever it might be and however much he might dissent from it: whether it was Dr Pusey at the time of his suspension, or the authors of *Essays and Reviews*, or Dr Colenso, or any other. "I have always been found," he writes, "and by God's grace I hope still to be found (when I am obliged to fight) fighting always against the popular, not the unpopular men of the day"[1]. On the other hand, he deliberately regarded it as part of his work to put himself in opposition to the ruling notions and current tendencies by which his age was dominated, in the name and under the guise of religion. He hated what he called "the religious world"[2], "the orthodox, who have changed the Son of Man and the Son of God into the Founder of their Religion"[3].

But in addition to the more general rancour with which he was pursued, and the constant attacks to which he subjected himself by his chivalrous courage, he was engaged in several greater controversies, two of which cannot be omitted in any account of his life.

(1) The first is that with the authorities of King's College London. They had already been much disturbed by his relations with the Christian Socialists, and Maurice had been made to feel in more ways than one that his position was none too secure. The publication of the *Theological Essays*, which he had prepared partly with a view to meeting the difficulties of men in doubt, partly as a kind of manifesto of his theological position in view of the current suspicion with which he was regarded[4], set the spark to the train. Dr Jelf, the Principal of the College, an amiable though by no means a strong man, whose worst fault was his

[1] *Life* ii. 367. [2] Ibid. ii. 294. [3] Ibid. ii. 458.

[4] The essays are concerned, as Bp Samuel Wilberforce wrote to Dr Jelf, with difficult and unsettled questions, or rather with the difficult and unsettled side of settled questions: *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* ii. 210.

too ready adoption of the current language of evangelical orthodoxy as the touchstone of the Faith, at once wrote to Maurice for an explanation of his teaching with regard to eternal punishment, and presently felt it to be his duty to place the correspondence before the Council of the College.

The question at issue may be simply stated. Maurice was no Universalist; he did not "disbelieve in Eternal Punishment," in the true sense, though he did in the popular sense of the word "Eternal." According to the views of current orthodoxy, the wicked were condemned at the day of judgement to a state of unending punishment. Maurice rejected this as a barbarous and un-Christian parody of the Truth. He held that God's rejection of sin, which is what we know as punishment, is indeed absolute and to the uttermost: there is no variableness in Him, neither shadow of turning. It is eternal, even as life in Him is eternal. But eternity must not be interpreted to mean an infinite series of years or days: it belongs to a different category altogether. And it does not follow that the sinner is for ever shut out from possibilities of amendment; rather we must believe that all that which we call punishment must have a remedial purpose in the counsels of God, and that His love for all men still yearns over them. Here however Maurice is full of a cautious reverence: he will not dogmatize beyond what God has revealed; rather his knowledge of the reality of the human will leads him to shrink from setting arbitrary limits to its capacity for resistance. But let us turn to his own words in a letter to Dr Hort from which we have already quoted: they are perhaps the most beautiful statement on the whole subject outside Holy Writ[1]. After careful study of our Lord's use of the word "eternal," he proceeds:

"Now, believing from my heart that the words in the twenty-fifth of St Matthew are as much our Lord's words as those in the seventeenth of St John, I am bound by reverence to Him—and if not by that, even by ordinary philological honesty—to apply to the former the meaning which I have

[1] As Hort wrote at the time, Maurice's whole defence was virtually an expansion of this letter: *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* i. 262.

learned from the latter, this being the strictest I can get. I am bound to apply that meaning to both cases in which the word is used, getting rid of the difference which our translators have (not honestly, or with great carelessness) introduced between 'everlasting' and 'eternal.' I am bound to believe that the eternal life into which the righteous go is that knowledge of God which *is* eternal life; I am bound to suppose that the eternal punishment into which those on the left hand go, is the loss of that eternal life—what is elsewhere called 'eternal death.'

"Now, if you ask me on the strength of this passage, or of any similar one, to dogmatize on the *duration* of future punishment, I feel obliged to say 'I cannot do so. I find *here* at least nothing on the subject. I cannot apply the idea of time to the word eternal.' I feel that I cannot, everybody feels it. What do the continual experiments to heap hundreds of thousands of years upon hundreds of thousands of years, and then the confession 'After all we are no nearer to eternity' mean, if not this? Do they not show that we are not even *on the way* to the idea of eternity? Might we not just as well have stopped at the hundredth year or the first? But this trifling becomes very serious and shocking, if there is a great and awful idea of eternity which our Lord would teach us, which belongs to our inmost selves, and which we are flying from by these efforts to get it into another region. For the idea of enjoying God or being without God, we unawares substitute that Mahometan felicity or Mahometan torment which you speak of, and the whole of Christianity becomes depraved in consequence.

"And yet do I then dogmatize on the other side? Do I fall back on the theory of Universal Restitution, which in my early days I found so unsatisfactory? No, I find it cold and unsatisfactory still. I cannot speak of God punishing for a number of years, and then ceasing to punish, or of the wicked expiating their crimes by a certain amount of penalties. The idea of a rebel will is, to those who know in themselves what it is, far too awful for such arrangements as these. A man who feels what sin means, who feels it as the contradiction to God's nature, the perfectly holy, and blessed, and loving nature, cannot feel any comfort in the thought of God leaving men alone, or hold out such a prospect as a comfort to his fellows. He feels that God is altogether Love, Light with no darkness at all. But then that which is without God, that which loves darkness, that which resists Love, must not it be miserable? And can it not fix itself in misery? Has it

not a power of defying that which seeks to subdue it? I know in myself that it has. I know that we may struggle with the Light, that we may choose death. But I know also that Love does overcome this rebellion. I know that I am bound to believe that its power is greater than every other. I am sure that Christ's death proves that death, hell, hatred are not so strong as their opposites. How can I reconcile these contradictory discoveries? I cannot reconcile them. I know no theory which can. But I can trust in Him who has reconciled the world to Himself. I can leave all in His hands. I dare not fix any limits to the power of His love. I cannot tell what are the limits to the power of a rebel will. I know that no man can be blessed, except his will is in accordance with God's will. I know it must be by an action on the will that love triumphs. Though I have no faith in man's theory of Universal Restitution, I am taught to expect 'a restitution of all things, which God who cannot lie has promised since the world began.' I am obliged to believe that we are living in a restored order; I am sure that restored order will be carried out by the full triumph of God's loving will. How that should take place while any rebellious will remains in His universe I cannot tell, though it is not for me to say that it is impossible; I do not want to say it, I wish to trust God absolutely, and not to trust in any conclusion of my own understanding at all"[1].

To return to the conflict with the authorities of King's College. The Council, consisting largely of laymen, most unfortunately presumed to take upon itself the functions of a judge in matters of faith, and at a special meeting on Oct. 27, 1853 they decided, on the motion of Bishop Blomfield of London[2], that Maurice's opinions on the subject were "of dangerous tendency and calculated to unsettle the minds of the theological students of King's College," and that the continuance of his connexion with it "would be seriously detrimental to its usefulness"[3]. This was done in spite of an earnest attempt of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford

[1] *Life* ii. 18–20.

[2] Ibid. ii. 197 f. Blomfield was of opinion that other essays in the volume were even more objectionable than that which dealt with the subject of Eternal Punishment, and wrote to Dr Jelf saying that whilst Professor Maurice held his chair, he should decline to receive the College Testimonial as a certificate (*Life of Bp Wilberforce* ii. 208).

[3] *Life* ii. 191.

to prove to Blomfield that Maurice's statements on the subject were in no way inconsistent with orthodoxy[1], and after the rejection of an amendment proposed by Mr. Gladstone, to the effect that "the Bishop of London be requested to appoint competent theologians to institute an examination" into the orthodoxy of Maurice's writings[2]. And, it must be added, the whole proceeding was carried out with a carelessness and lack of judicial fairness, not to use stronger language, that would have been most reprehensible had the business been purely formal instead of being of such vital importance[3]. The whole thing of course is now a matter of past history, and it is hard to realize that a man could ever have been expelled from such a position for holding doctrine which is in no sense whatever contrary to the Faith. Even at the time it gave rise to a very widespread feeling of indignation, and did much harm to the cause of the Church. For the rest, it gave us one of the noblest of Tennyson's shorter poems; it caused the expelled teacher's colleagues and pupils to love him even more, if that were possible, when they saw how he bore the blow; and it has left amongst his successors at King's College a tenderness and a reverence for his name which will not easily fade away.

(2) The other great controversy of his life was that on the subject of the true nature of Revelation. In 1858 the Bampton Lectures were preached by Henry Longueville Mansel, subsequently Dean of St Paul's, and they were published under the title *The Limits of Religious Thought examined.* In these, following in Butler's steps, the author makes a much-needed protest against the tendency to over-estimate the powers of the human mind to judge *a priori* of what is

[1] *Life of Bp Wilberforce* ii. 214. He also wrote to Dr Jelf in the same sense, and drew up a statement on the subject, which Maurice gladly accepted as a true expression of his meaning, in the hope that it would satisfy them (ibid. 210 f.). Bishop Lonsdale of Lichfield also expressed his dissatisfaction at what had been done, and the way in which it had been done (ibid. 208; and *Life* ii. 196).

[2] *Life* ii. 192. Mr Gladstone's amendment was supported by Sir James Patteson, Sir Benjamin Brodie, and Mr J. H. Green (ibid. ii. 196).

[3] The main facts are given in the *Life* ii. 188–202.

probable in a divine revelation. But he goes much further, and denies that we have or can have any true knowledge of the eternal nature of God. All that we can do is to submit ourselves to the guidance of two things which he does not attempt to define more exactly, Revelation and Conscience. These, as Mr R. H. Hutton has not unfairly summarized the argument, "both alike help to teach us, not what God is, but how we may think of Him with least risk of unspeakable error. By these necessarily indirect hints, the truest of which our nature is capable, Dr Mansel entreats us to hold, and to guide our footsteps, calling them 'regulative truths,' by which he means the best working hypotheses we are able to attain of the character and purposes of God [1] . . . But, to use Dr Mansel's own words, 'how far that knowledge represents God as He is we know not, and have no need to know'" [2]. It follows that on this hypothesis "we cannot argue against a certain doctrine of the Atonement on the ground of its injustice, because we cannot know what justice or goodness in God means" [3].

The argument was accepted on many sides as a valuable apologetic weapon. But it plainly involves using language in an utterly unnatural sense [4]; the religion in defence of which it can be used is in reality pure agnosticism [5]; and the indignation which it aroused in Maurice may be easily

[1] Perhaps this is going too far. See Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, ed. 1858, p. 126. The true mode of contemplating the Deity is that which "views the object in a manner accommodated to the finite capacities of the human thinker," and "is content to view Him in those relations in which He has been pleased to manifest Himself to His creatures." It tells us "not what God is in Himself, but how He wills that we should think of Him." The point of Mansel's teaching is not that our so-called knowledge is a 'working hypothesis,' but that it is a kind of knowledge at second hand.

[2] R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*, ed. 1888, p. 86. The whole essay on "What is Revelation" is a noble vindication of Maurice's whole position.

[3] Gore, *Bampton Lectures* 115.

[4] John Stuart Mill made a noble protest against both the language and the thing which it signified: "I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go": *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, 1872, p. 129; quoted by Gore, *op. cit.* p. 116.

[5] It has been so claimed by Mr Leslie Stephen: *Life* ii. 328.

imagined. "It was not merely an embodiment of a completely opposite conviction, but the insurrection of an outraged faith, the protest of a powerful character against a doctrine which pronounces that all the springs of its life have been delusions, and which tries to pass off human notions of God in the place of God"[1]. If this be true, then Maurice's faith in a God who has made us in His image and vouchsafes to make Himself known to us is only a delusion: must we not rather say that the Church's Creed is wholly fictitious, and that God still remains unknown? Into the controversy that ensued between Maurice and Mansel, in which few really saw what was involved, we need not enter now: it must suffice to say that Maurice restates what is really the teaching of his whole life with force and vigour and passion, and with a consuming earnestness which is very moving[2]. In course of time men have come to see what was really involved as they could not at the time; and although the shattering of belief has been all the greater because the shock came from within and not from without, it seems probable that its effects are passing away now. But whenever the day comes for the history of the agnosticism of the nineteenth century to be written from without, as that of the deism of the eighteenth has been, Mansel must take his place with Sir William Hamilton and Mr Herbert Spencer as one of its leaders, whilst it can hardly be doubted that Frederick Denison Maurice will stand out, not so much by his professed writings against Manselism as by the whole message of his life, as one of the greatest forces on the other side.

VIII

Such was Maurice's life-work: he was constantly teaching, writing, guiding, organizing; training up others to do the same kind of work, but giving them something of his spirit, never simply of his views. His method was ever the same:

[1] R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays* 86.

[2] "It was written in great heat and vehemence of spirit," he wrote afterwards to Kingsley, "I suppose with less calmness than befitted such a subject. But I did feel then and feel now that it is the most important controversy of our time; and that all others must depend upon it": *Life* ii. 498.

drawing out all that was best in others, never trying to force himself upon them; going as far as possible with his opponent, and always endeavouring to discover some bond between them, some common ground deeper down than their disagreement; and abhorring nothing so much as the spirit of partisanship which so often causes disunion and hazards the cause of the Truth by presuming to be its advocate[1]. What he was in himself we know from his own words, from the records of his life, the testimony of his friends. They tell us of his earnestness in prayer[2], his prophetic reality of manner and utterance[3], his freshness and eagerness[4], the well of sympathy which never failed to those who needed it[5], the readiness to acknowledge his own ignorance[6], and much more. Hasty and petulant he might appear; obscure and hard to follow he sometimes was; but none who came into actual contact with him could doubt that he was indeed a man of God.

I have failed to show you Maurice as he was: but then I did not expect to succeed. You cannot really show what a prophet is, because it is his work to tell what becomes obvious to all men as soon as he has said it. It is hard for us, as I have said already, to realize anything like the real value or even the whole substance of his message, simply because he has delivered it and we all, in some small measure, have heard. But at least we may realize something of it if we compare theological writings of the period just before he wrote with those which have followed: if we compare English

[1] See in particular his words on Tertullian: *Epistle to the Hebrews* p. xciii, and especially the lecture on Tertullian in the *Ecclesiastical History of the First Two Centuries.*

[2] See especially the *Life* i. 205, and ii. 285.

[3] This struck all men. See Hort's account of his first sight of him: *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort* i. 153 f., ii. 71; or J. R. Green's description of his preaching: *Letters of J. R. Green* p. 128 f.

[4] Caroline Fox notes that he entered "like a girl" into the heights and depths of Miss Bremer's characters: *op. cit.* 259.

[5] See for example his old colleague C. H. Pearson's *Memorials*, ed. W. Stebbing.

[6] See a letter of Caroline Fox in which she tells of a conversation with him on the evils of war. "'Won't the world some day come to think with us?' quoth I. 'They will come to think rightly,' was his reply, 'but perhaps very differently to you or I'": *op. cit.* p. 295.

religion as he found it with English religion as it has become since his day.

"When Maurice began to write, Theology was the repetition of the formulas of the fourth and sixteenth centuries; every word of the Bible was divinely dictated, equally important and equally infallible; human reason was out of place in the sphere of religion, which consisted mainly in emotional utterance or ritual observance; the operation of Divine grace was limited by the recognition of the three Orders and of Apostolic Succession, or else by the assurance of conversion on the part of the individual; art, science, politics and social life belonged to the world, which was either forbidden ground, or at least so full of snares as to make it hazardous for the ordinary Christian to venture upon"[1].

When we remember the share which Maurice had in making these things to be things of the past, we shall come to the conclusion, I think, that he was beyond question the greatest seer of the century: and this not because he had or claimed to have some occult or private message, but because he brought men back from words to things, and set before them, in a larger light, the Faith which was once for all delivered to the Saints, that Faith which is yearned for in all human aspirations, which is witnessed to in every Scripture, and which underlies all human formularies.

[1] Dr J. B. Mayor, in the *Spectator* for Oct. 16, 1897.

INDEX

Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke, 332.
Adair, Bishop, 97 f.
Admonition, The, drawn up by Cecil, 6 *n.*
Admonition to Parliament, 19 *n.*
Advertisements, Parker's, 17; their importance, 18 and *note.*
Airy's edition of Burnet's *Own Times*, 149 *n.*, 158 *n.*, 159 *n.*, 164 *n.*, 167 *n.*, 168 *n.*, 169 *n.*, 172 *n.*, 173 *n.*, 177 *n.*
ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΟΣ, 98 *n.*
Allen, Ralph, 224.
Andrewes, Bishop, 31, 71, 106, 119.
Anne, Queen, 188.
Anthem sung at a consecration of bishops by Bramhall, 114 *n.*
Arminius, 286.
Articles of Religion (English), 15; Burnet on, 153, 185 f.
Articles of Religion (Irish), of 1566, 86; of 1615, 66 f., 72, 73, 86, 92, 93 *n.*; of 1634, 72, 92.
Athenaeum, the, 331.
Atterbury, Bishop, 188, 190, 249, 302.
Austen, Miss, 222.

Bacon, Sir Francis (Lord), 206.
— Sir Nicholas, 7, 10.
Baillie, Robert, 97 *n.*, 98 *n.*, 106, 217.
Bancroft, Archbishop, 31, 63.
Bannatyne Miscellany, 160 *n.*, 161 *n.*
Baptism, Simeon's view of, 288 f.; Gorham's, 317; Maurice's, 349.
Barillon, M., 178.
Baring Gould's *Life of Hawker*, 310 *n.*
Barnabas Pimlico, St, 317.
Barrington, Bishop Shute, 303.
Barwick's *Life of Barwick*, 102 *n.*, 110 *n.*, 113 *n.*, 114 *n.*
Baxter, Richard, 106, 129, 142, 143 *n.*, 144, 145, 159.
Becket, Thomas, 308.
Bedell, Bishop, 72, 91, 94 *n.*, 98, 109 *n.*
Berkeley, Bishop, 215.
Bernard, J. H., 196 *n.*
Berry Pomeroy case, 310 *n.*
Bible Society, 279 f., 283.
Bilson, Bishop, 31.
Birch's *Life of Robert Boyle*, 94 *n.*
Bishoprics, Irish, state of, 85 *n.*, 88.
Bishops' Bible, 20.
'Bishops,' Lutheran, 112 *n.*
Bishopsbourne, Hooker at, 28.
'Black Oath,' 99.
Blackmore's *Maid of Sker*, 310.
Blomfield, Bishop, Trollope's character sketch of, 299; dissents from the Gorham judgements, 318; his share in Maurice's dismissal, 355 f.
Boleyn, Anne, 7.
Bolingbroke, 188, 190, 216, 221, 224, 250.
Book of Sports, 67.
Bossuet, 174.
Boswell, 152.
Boyle State Papers, 115 *n.*
Braithwaite's *Life of Gurney*, 278 *n.*, 281 *n.*, 282 *n.*, 284 *n.*
'Bramble, Bishop,' 97 *n.*, 98.
Bramhall, John, authorities for, 81 *n.*; early life, 82 f.; controversy with Hungate, 83; goes to Ireland with Strafford, 85; takes the lead in Irish Reformation, 87; bishop of Derry, 88; first meets Laud, 89; his work for church property, 89 f.; for church order, 90–93; administrative work, 94; dealings with puritans, 96 f.; speech against Adair, 98 *n.*; impeached, 100; his wanderings, 101 f.; assumes the name John Pierson, 103 *n.*; his famous letter to Usher, ib.; his defence of the English Church, 105, 109 f.; his writings against Hobbes, 106 f.; his epitaph, 106 *n.*; against Romanism, 107 f.; on Anglican orders, 110; on sectarianism, 111; on the reformed churches, 112; proposed consecration of bishops by, 113; archbishop of Armagh, 114; speaker of Irish House of Lords, 115; his work as primate, 116 f.; death and character, 118 f.; referred to, 72, 127.
'Bramhell, Bishop,' 98 *n.*
Bray's *Evelyn*, 102 *n.*, 103 *n.*, 114 *n.*
Breda, Declaration of, 75.
Bremer, Miss, 359 *n.*
'Broad Church,' 346 f.
Brodie, Sir Benjamin, 356 *n.*
Broglie, duchesse de, 285.
Brougham, Lord, 318 *n.*
Brown, David, 273 f.
Browning, Robert, 66.
Buckingham, Duke of, 167.
Bull, Bishop, 31.

Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, 287.
Burke, Edmund, 218.
Burnet, Gilbert, authorities for, 149 *n.*; early life, 155; goes to Holland, 159; ordained, 160; at Glasgow, 162 f.; on polygamy, 164 f.; on non-resistance, 165; comes to London, 168; on dissent and Romanism, 169 f.; leaves England, 177; visits William and Mary, 179; bishop of Salisbury, 182; on nonjurors and toleration, 183; on comprehension, 184; becomes an Erastian, 187; his later work, 188 f.
His character, 150 f.; as a politician, 154; *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 153, 185 f.; *History of the Reformation*, 153, 174 f.; *History of his Own Times*, 155, 169, 181.
— Thomas, 149 *n.*, 155.
— William, 156.
Butler, Charles, Phillpotts in controversy with, 304, 316.
— Joseph, on the decay of Christianity, 195; his devout character, 196 f.; his message, 198 f.; his *Sermons at the Rolls*, 196, 198, 201, 207; his *Analogy*, 195, 197, 203, 207 f.; on conscience, 199; on probability, 202; compared with Newton, 203 ff.; at Stanhope, 303 f., 307 *n.*; referred to, 31, 215, 247, 356.
Byron, Lord, 222.

Calvin, John, 109 *n.*, 286.
Calvinism, extent of its influence, 61; in Ireland, 69, 86; Bramhall on, 109 *n.*; Warburton on, 217.
Cambridge in Simeon's day, 265, 266 *n.*
Cambridge Platonists, 38, 157.
Camden, William, 66.
Campbell, J. Dykes, 344 *n.*
— Prof. Lewis, 342 *n.*
Canning, George, Phillpotts's letters to, 306.
Canons (Irish) of 1634, 72, 93, 94 *n.*
Canterburian's Self-conviction, 97 *n.*
Carey (the missionary), 274.
Carr, J. A., 85 *n.*
Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, 93 *n.*, 98 *n.*, 116 *n.*, 133.
Cartwright, Thomas, 27, 29.
Carus, Canon, 259 *n.*
Carus', *Life of Simeon*, 259 *n.*, 268 *n.*, 269 *n.*, 271 *n.*, 281 *n.*, 286 *n.*, 287 *n.*, 289 *n.*
Casaubon, Isaac, 66, 68, 73.
Cashel, Synod of, 92.
Catharine, Queen, 164.
Cecil, Robert, 276.
Cecil, Sir William, Lord Burghley, 3 *n.*, 5, 6, 10, 18, 21, 62.
Chalcedon, titular bishop of, 109.
Challoner, Phoebe, marries Usher, 63.
Chappell, William, 87 *n.*, 101 *n.*
Charles I, 38, 71, 74, 84, 125, 133.
— II, 102, 103 *n.*, 114, 130, 150, 164, 166, 171, 177.
Chatham, Lord, 224, 247.
Cheynell, William, 39 f.
Chillingworth, William, his early life, 38; becomes a papist and returns, 39; takes part in the Civil War, ib.; his writings, 40 ff.; on private judgement, 41; on the variations of Romanism, 42; on infallibility, 42 f.; on the Roman theory of intention, 44 f.; his message, 46, 52; his latitudinarianism, 47 f.; as an interpreter of scripture, 52 f.; his soteriology, 53; his influence on Taylor, 125; referred to, 145, 248.
'Chowne, Parson,' 310.
Church, Dean, 33.
Church goods, proceedings regarding, 15 f.
Church Missionary Society, 272, 276, 278 f., 283.
Clapham sect, 274 f., 279.
Clarendon State Papers, 97 *n.*, 102 *n.*
Clarkson, 284.
Claude, the Huguenot, 269.
Clogy's *Life of Bedell*, 87 *n.*, 94 *n.*, 97 *n.*, 98 *n.*
Cockburn's *Specimen*, 149 *n.*
Colenso, Bishop, 321, 352.
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, on Jeremy Taylor, 140; Maurice's debt to, 343 f.
'Coleridgians, the,' 344.
Collingwood, Elizabeth, marries Bramhall, 83 *n.*
Commons' Journal (Ireland), 100 *n.*, 101 *n.*, 115 *n.*
Convocation, Burnet condemns, 187; Warburton upholds, 249; Phillpotts helps to revive, 321.
— (English) of 1563, 12, 14 f., 17.
— (Irish) of 1615, 66; of 1634, 72, 91 f.; of 1661, 84 *n.*, 115.
Conway, Lord, 130.
Conybeare, W. J., 346.
Cooper, Walter, 102.
Corbet, John, 97.
Corrie, Bishop, 275, 283.
Cosin, Bishop, 81, 89 *n.*
Cottenham, Lord, 317.
Cotton, Sir R., 66, 74.
Cotton's *Fasti*, 94 *n.*, 116 *n.*, 118 *n.*

Covenant, Scottish, 95, 97 *n.*, 99, 133 f., 155.
Cranmer, Thomas, 174.
Creighton, M., Bishop of London, xv, 244.
— R., Bishop of Bath and Wells, 98 *n.*
Cromwell, Oliver, 68, 76, 82 *n.*, 127, 130.
Cryptocalvinism, 62.
Cudworth, Ralph, 158, 248.

Daly, Judge, 285.
Dampier, Bishop of Ely, 317.
Dartmouth, Lord, 151.
Davenport, Christopher, 125.
Davies, J. Llewelyn, 342.
Declarations of Indulgence, 168 *n.*, 180, 181.
Deism, controversy with, 220.
Delegates, Court of, 318 *n.*
Denny, E., 12 *n.*
Derry, meaning of, 90 *n.*
'Device for Alteration of Religion,' 3 *n.*
Devonport Society, 312.
Diaconate, permanent, 314.
Diocesan Synods revived, 313.
Dioceses, formation of new, 312.
'Divers Points of Religion,' 3 *n.*
Dixon, R. W., 3 *n.*, 7 *n.*, 11 *n.*, 12 *n.*, 14 *n.*, 16 *n.*, 20 *n.*
Dods, Marcus, 141 *n.*, 335 *n.*
Dopping, Bishop Anthony, 94 *n.*
Duppa, Bishop, 113 *n.*
Durham, Lord, 308.

Ecce Homo, 221.
Edinburgh Review, 346.
Eldon, Lord, 301 *n.*, 303.
Elizabeth of Bohemia, Queen, 114 *n.*
Elizabeth of England, Queen, 3, 5, 10, 11, 31, 62, 235.
Elliot's *Specimen*, 149 *n.*
Elrington, Dr, 69, 93 *n.*, 101 *n.*, 103 *n.*
England, Church of, under the Commonwealth, 103, 126; Bramhall's defence of, 109, 110; in the eighteenth century, 219 f.
Enthusiasm in the eighteenth century, 220.
Epistle Congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, 97 *n.*
Erskine of Linlathen, Thomas, 286, 344 f., 347 *n.*
Essays and Reviews, 321, 352.
Essex, Earl of, 154, 171, 176.
d'Estrées, Cardinal, 178.
Eternal Punishment, 353 f.
Eustace Conway, 331.
Evelyn, John, 102 *n.*, 103 *n.*, 114 *n.*, 130.

Falkland, Lord, 39, 40.
Farrish, Professor, 265.
Fell, Dr, 158.
Ferguson, Robert, 182.
Ferrar, Nicholas, 31.
Fisher, John, the Jesuit, 39.
FitzGerald, Mr, 93 *n.*
Fitzgerald's *Life of Butler*, 304.
FitzRalph, Archbishop, 116 *n.*
Fitzsymons, the Jesuit, 63.
Fletcher of Madeley, 258, 291.
Fox, Caroline, 334 *n.*, 359 *n.*
— R. B., 334 *n.*
Foxcroft's *Life of Halifax*, 171 *n.*
Frewen, Archbishop, 114 *n.*
Fuller, Thomas, 27, 76, 323.
— Bishop William, 81 *n.*
Fust, Sir Herbert Jenner, 318.

Gambetta, M., 252.
Gardiner, Dr S. R., 85 *n.*, 102 *n.*, 218.
— Stephen, 308.
George III, 261.
George's in the East, St, 317.
Gierke, Dr, 231.
Gillow's *Bibliographical Dictionary*, 83 *n.*
Giraldus Cambrensis, 92 *n.*
Gladstone, William Ewart, 356.
Gloucester, siege of, 39.
'Golden Grove,' 126.
Gooderick, 3 *n.*
Gore, Bishop C., 357 *n.*
Gorham controversy, 313, 315, 317 f.
Gospel of the Resurrection, 221.
Grant, Charles, 275, 277.
'Grantley, Archdeacon,' and his sons, 299.
Green, J. H., 356 *n.*
Green, J. R., on Maurice, 359 *n.*
Gregory Thaumaturgus, St, 343 *n.*
Greville's *Memoirs*, 307, 318 *n.*
Grey, Lord, 304, 307, 308.
Grey's *Debates*, 168 *n.*
Grimston, Sir Harbottle, 169.
Grotius, 166, 176, 248.
Grub, George, 95 *n.*, 164 *n.*
Gurney, J. J., 281, 282 *n.*, 284 *n.*

Haddan, A. W., 81 *n.*, 99 *n.*, 107 *n.*, 110.
Hales, John, 39, 48.
Halifax, Lord, 150, 154, 171, 234.
Hall, Bishop of Chester, 117 *n.*
Halley, William, 83 *n.*
Hamilton, Duchess of, 162, 163.
— Duke of, 166.
— Mr, 60, 61, 67.
— Sir W., 358.
Hammond, Henry, 127, 133, 144, 145.
Hampden controversy, 309.
Hampton, Archbishop, 70 f.
Hanna, W., 344 *n.*

Hare, Julius Charles, 283, 330, 342.
Harleston, Margaret, marries Parker, 8; dies, 20 f.
Hearne's *Diaries*, 190.
Heber, Bishop, 141.
Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*, 221.
Henry, Philip, 117 *n.*
Herbert, George, 31.
Heylin, Peter, 93 *n.*
Hickes, Dr, 165 *n.*
Higgons's *Historical and Critical Remarks*, 149 *n.*, 165 *n.*
High Commission, 12, 16 *n.*, 19 *n.*, 180, 308.
— (Irish), 98.
Hoare, Henry, 321.
Hobbes, Thomas, 40, 47, 105 f., 165 *n.*, 226 *n.*, 227, 236; Bramhall's controversy with, 107.
Hooker, Richard, his early life, 26; marriage, 25; Master of the Temple, 27; writes the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 28; last illness and death, 29; his teaching, 30–34; quoted or referred to, 109 *n.*, 119, 129, 157, 235, 248.
Horne, Bishop of Winchester, 12.
Hort, F. J. A., 252; on Coleridge, 343.
Hort, *Life and Letters of*, 333 *n.*, 336 *n.*, 353, 359 *n.*
Houghton, the Jesuit, 83.
Howard, Cardinal, 178.
Howlet, Richard, 82 *n.*
Hoyle, Dr, 93 *n.*
Hume, David, 215 *n*, 221, 343.
Hungate, the Jesuit, 83.
Huntingdon, Lady, 222.
Hurd, Warburton's letters to, 216 *n.*, 220 *n.*, 222 *n.*, 223 *n.*, 224, 240 *n.*, 244 *n.*, 245 *n.*, 249 *n.*, 250 *n.*, 253 *n.*
Hutton, R. H., 342 *n.*, 348 *n.*, 357, 358 *n.*
Hyde, Sir Edward, 97 *n.*, 102, 113 *n.*, 114 *n.*

Ignatius, St, 76.
Illingworth, J. R., 221.
Important Considerations, &c., 14 *n.*
India, mission work in, 273 ff.
Infallibility, Chillingworth on, 42 f., 48 f.
Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, by whom prepared, 6; their provisions respecting ornaments, 16 *n.*
Innocent XI, Pope, 178.
Ireland, Church of, its condition in the seventeenth century, 68, 85; Bramhall's account of, 87 f., 94 f.; Taylor's, 135.
'Irish Canterbury,' 87.
Irish language, use of, 72, 86 *n.*, 94 *n.*, 135.
Jacobson, Bishop, 332.
James I, 63, 67, 71, 76.
James II, 154, 164, 166, 177, 178, 180.
James, Dr Montague, 20 *n.*
Jebb, John, Bishop of Limerick, 287.
Jeffrey, Francis, 304.
Jelf, Dr, 352, 355 *n.*, 356 *n.*
Jewell, Bishop, 26, 119.
Jews, Simeon's zeal for conversion of, 281.
Johnston, Sir Archibald, 155.
Joyce, P. W., 90 *n.*
Juxon, Bishop, 124.

Kant, 221, 343.
Keble, John, 302, 313, 320.
Keene, Bishop, 307 *n.*
Ken, Bishop, 31.
Kennet's *Register and Chronicle*, 106 *n.*, 114 *n.*
Kenwyn, rectory of, 312.
Kettlewell, the non-juror, 262.
King, Henry, Bishop of Chichester, 113 *n.*
King's College London, Maurice at, 332; his dismissal from, 353–6.
Kingsley, Charles, 339 *n.*, 340 *n.*, 349 *n.*, 351, 358 *n.*
Knight Bruce, Vice-Chancellor, 318.
Knott, Edward, 40, 53.

Langsdale, Phoebe, marries Jeremy Taylor, 124.
Large Supplement, &c., 97 *n.*
Lassalle, 217.
Lathbury's *History of the Nonjurors*, 186 *n.*, 190 *n.*
Latimer, Bishop, 266.
Latitudinarianism of Chillingworth, 48; of Taylor, 125, 139; of Burnet, 153, 183 ff., 190.
Laud, William, godfather of Chillingworth, 39; his work with Strafford, 86 f.; with Bramhall, 89 f.; befriends Jeremy Taylor, 123 f.; referred to, 38, 48, 73 f., 75, 77, 81, 82 *n.*, 85 *n.*, 95 *n.*, 106, 110, 125, 218, 308.
Lauderdale, Duke of, 150, 154, 159 *n.*, 162 ff., 166 ff.
Lauderdale Papers, 149 *n.*, 164 *n.*, 169 *n.*
Law, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 287.
Law's *Serious Call*, 264.
Leibnitz, 107 *n.*
Leighton, Archbishop, 74, 134, 145 f., 150, 158, 161, 162, 164.
Leslie, Henry, 96.
Lessing, 343.
Letter of Intelligence out of Holland, 103 *n.*
Leviathan, 106 *n.*, 107.

Lightfoot, Bishop, 70.
Lingard, Dr, 304.
Littleton, Sir Thomas, 171.
Locke, John, 40, 153, 187, 227, 228, 235, 248.
Loewe, Dr. J. H., 107 *n.*
Loftus, Dudley, 83 *n.*, 90 *n.*, 114 *n.*, 115 *n.*, 116 *n.*, 118.
London Missionary Society, 275 f.
Lonsdale, Bishop of Lichfield, 356 *n.*
Lords' Journals (Ireland), 98 *n.*, 100 *n.*, 115 *n.*
Lotze, 221.
Louis XIV, 176, 177, 178, 187.
Luther, Martin, 165.
Lutheranism never a power outside Germany, 62; Bramhall on, 112 *n.*
Luttrell, Narcissus, 181 *n.*

Macaulay, Lord, 181 *n.*, 218, 291.
Machiavelli, 233.
Maitland, Professor, 231.
Malet, Sir John, 168 *n.*
Mandeville, 221.
Manning, Henry Edward, 310 *n.*, 320.
Mansel, H. L., Maurice's controversy with, 356 f.
Mansfield, Lord, 224.
Mant, Bishop, 81 *n.*, 93 *n.*
Marriott, Charles, 283.
Marsden, 268.
Marshall, Prof. A., 335 *n.*
Marshman, 274.
Marston Moor, battle of, 101.
Martyn, Henry, 275–8, 283 f.
Mary, Queen of Scots, 13, 19.
Mary II, Queen of England, 179, 188.
Marx, Karl, 217.
Maskell, William, 320.
Mason, the poet, 250 *n.*
— W. M., 114 *n.*
Matthew, Archbishop Toby, 83 f.
Maurice, Frederick Denison, 283; his place in religious history, 328, 360; early life, 329 f.; at Cambridge, 330; in London, 331; main facts of his life, 332; *Kingdom of Christ*, 333; *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 334; *Theological Essays*, 333 *n.*, 352; not primarily a writer, 335; his message, 336 f.; how he became a Christian, ib.; and a churchman, 338; a theologian above all, 341; his wide reading, 343 f.; no party can claim him, 363 f., 350; on baptism, 349; practical work, 350 f.; teaching on eternal punishment, 353 f.; dismissed from King's College, 355 f.; controversy with Mansel, 356 f.; personal characteristics, 348, 359.
— Michael, 329.
— Priscilla, 329.
— Sir J. F., 328.
Mayor, Dr J. B., 360.
Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained, 40.
Mervyn, Sir Audley, 100 *n.*, 118.
Micklethwait, 114 *n.*
Mill, John Stuart, 206, 235; on Maurice, 334 *n.*, 342 *n.*, 344; on Mansel's theology, 357 *n.*
Milners, the, 284.
Missions, Warburton on, 249; Simeon's devotion to, 272 f.
Mitchell, A. F., 86 *n.*
Molesworth, W. N., 309 *n.*
Monmouth's rebellion, 177, 178.
More, Henry, 157, 158.
Moule, Bishop, 273, 293 f.
Moule's *Simeon*, 269 *n.*, 272 *n.*, 278 *n.*
Moulin, Peter du, 103 *n.*
Musgrave, Archbishop, 318.

Napier's Logarithms, 65.
Nasmith's *Catalogue of Parker MSS.*, 20 *n.*
Neri, St. Philip, 261.
Newcastle, Marquess of, 101, 106.
Newman, John Henry, 125, 217, 243, 263, 283, 291, 315.
Newton, Isaac, his *Principia*, 203 f.; his epitaph, 204.
Nicholas, Secretary, 97 *n.*, 114 *n.*
Nicholson, William, 125.
Nonjurors, 182 f., 186, 218.
Nordau, Dr, 247.
Northern Rebellion, 18.

Occasional Conformity, 187, 188.
Orders, Anglican, 11 f.; Bramhall on, 110; not a primary question in his day, 107 *n.*; Bramhall's care for, 117; Taylor's, 134.
Origen's method of study, 343.
Origin of Species, 222.
Ormonde, Duke of, 115 *n.*, 134.
Ornaments Rubric, 15 f.; how far affected by the *Interpretations* and *Advertisements*, 18.
Orrery, Earl of, 115 *n.*, 116.
Overall, Bishop, 31.

Page, Mr W., 16 *n.*
Paget, Bishop, 31.
Parker, Matthew, his early life, 8; chaplain to Anne Boleyn, 7; Dean of Lincoln, 9; concerned in drawing up the Oath in the Injunctions, 6 *n.*; his consecration, 10 f.;

Parker, Matthew (*contd.*)
visits his province, 12; presides over Convocation of 1563, 14 f., 17; his *Advertisements*, 17; enforces conformity against Puritans, 18; against Romanists, 19; prepares the Bishops' Bible, 20; writes the *Antiquities*, ibid.; death and character, 21.
Parliamentary History, 163 *n.*, 168 *n.*, 186 *n.*, 187 *n.*
Parr's *Life of Usher*, 103 *n.*
Pascal, 131.
Patteson, Sir James, 356 *n.*
Pearson, C. H., 359 *n.*
Pearson, John, 81, 144, 158.
Peel, Sir Robert, 306.
Penn, William, 228.
Perse, Stephen, 123.
Peterborough, Countess of, 76.
Phillpotts, Henry, Trollope's character sketch, 299; his early life, 310 f.; rector of Stanhope, 303; in controversy with Lingard, 304; *Letters to Charles Butler*, 304 f.; Bishop of Exeter, 306 f.; opposes the Reform Bills, 308 f.; administration of his diocese, 310 f.; the Theological College, 311; increase of the Episcopate, 312; the Devonport Society, 312 f.; Diocesan Synod, 313; his theological position, 314 f.; Gorham controversy, 317; his share in revival of Convocation, 321; old age and death, 322 f.
'Pierson, John,' 103.
Pitt the elder, *see* Chatham.
Pitt the younger, 275.
Pocock, N., 149 *n.*, 175 *n.*
Pococke, Edmund, 158.
Pole, Reginald, 7.
Polygamy, Burnet on, 164.
Pope's *Essay on Man*, 199, 223; epitaph on Newton, 204; *Dunciad*, 224.
Port Royal, 132.
Postscript for the Personate Jesuit, 97 *n.*
Potter, Christopher, 40.
Pratt, Josiah, 276.
Prayer-book of Elizabeth, its provisions, 15.
Presbyterians, ordained by Bramhall, 114 *n.*, 117, 118 *n.*; by Taylor, 134; Burnet on, 157; negociations with, 164.
Preston, Lord, 176 *n.*
Price, Thomas, 93 *n.*
Priestley, Joseph, 329.
Private judgement, 41.
Protestant, Warburton's definition of a, 244.
Protestantism, reaction against at Cambridge, 37; at Oxford, 38; Chillingworth's new, 40 ff.; strengthened by Burnet's *History*, 175 f.
Prynne, 217.
Purcell's *Life of Manning*, 310 *n.*
Puritanism, rise of, 14, 17; secession begins, 18; its strength and claims, 29 f.; refuted by Hooker, 30; in Ireland, 94 f.
Pusey, Dr, 263, 283, 313, 315, 316, 319, 352.

Quakerism, 228, 233, 333.
Queen Anne's Bounty, 188.
Queen's College London, 350.

Radcliffe, Sir George, 85 *n.*, 93 *n.*, 98 *n.*, 101 *n.*, 107 *n.*; on Episcopacy, 112 *n.*
Rahem, Mohammed, 277.
Ranelagh, Lord, 90 *n.*
Ranke, von, 149 *n.*, 183 *n.*, 186 *n.*, 187 *n.*
Rawdon Papers, 81 *n.*, 93 *n.*, 97 *n.*, 101 *n.*, 102 *n.*, 106 *n.*, 107 *n.*, 113 *n.*, 114 *n.*
Records of Marischal College, 156 *n.*
Reformed churches, Bramhall on, 109 f., 112, 118 *n.*
Reid, J. S., 87 *n.*, 93 *n.*, 94 *n.*, 96 *n.*, 117 *n.*
Relton, F., 196 *n.*
Review of the Seditious Pamphlet, &c., 98 *n.*
Ripon, Bramhall's influence at, 84.
Risden, Thomas, 123.
Robertson, Prof. Croom, 107 *n.*
Robinson, Colonel, 245.
— Thomas, of Leicester, 259 f., 283.
Romaine, 258, 260.
Roman Catholics, in early years of Elizabeth, 14, 18; proceedings against, 19; activity of, against Charles I, 103 *n.*; proselytising under the Commonwealth, 111 *n.*, 128; liberties withheld from, 169, 183 f., 187, 226, 234; granted, 306.
Roman Controversy, Chillingworth's contribution to, 40 ff.; Bramhall's, 107 f.; Jeremy Taylor's, 125, 128, 131; Burnet's 169 f.; Warburton's, 234 f.; Phillpotts's, 304 f.
Roscommon, Earl of, 101 *n.*
Rousseau, 220 *n.*, 228.
Routh, Dr, 303, 314.
'Rupert of ecclesiastical debate,' 309.
Rushworth's *Collections*, 100 *n.*
Russell, Lady, 177 *n.*
— Lord John, 177 *n.*
— Lord William, 154, 171, 176, 177.
Russell, Memoirs of the Rev. John, 310 *n.*
Rust, Bishop, 124, 137.

Sacheverell, Dr, 188, 302.
Sackville, Mr, 129.
Sancta Clara, Franciscus a, 125.
Sanderson, Bishop, 144 f.
Sandys, Archbishop, 27.
Saravia, Hadrian, hears Hooker's confession, 29, 31.
Sargent's *Memoir of Martyn*, 277 *n.*
Savile, Sir Henry, 66.
Schelling, 343.
Schism, the chief allegation against Anglicans in Bramhall's day, 107.
Schwartz, 274.
Scotland, Episcopal Church of, 85 *n.*, 95 *n.*, 156, 158, 160 ff.
Scott, Thomas, 276.
Scudamore, Lord, 105 *n.*
Selden, John, 66.
Sellon, Miss, 312 f.
Shaftesbury, Lord, 171, 176, 221, 250.
Shairp, J. C., 345 *n.*, 347 *n.*
Shakespeare, Warburton's edition of, 224.
Sharp, Archbishop, 162.
Sheldon, Gilbert, 39, 81, 124, 308.
Shore, Mr, of Berry Pomeroy, 310 *n.*
Shore, Sir John, 279.
Shutte's *Life of Bishop Phillpotts*, 301.
Sidney, Algernon, 171, 176.
Simeon, Charles, his early life, 261 f.; ordained, 266; visit to Fletcher, 258; to Venn, 264; vicar of Trinity Church, 266; manner of life, 268; preaches before the University, 269; the real founder of the C.M.S., 272; zeal for missions, 273 f.; his love for Martyn, 278; the Bible Society, 279; the Jews' Society, 281; visit to Amsterdam, 282; to Ireland, 284; weak points of his system, 287 f.; his view of Baptism, 288 f.; personal characteristics, 289 f.; illness and death, 292 f.
Sisterhoods, 312 f.
Smith, Adam, 219.
— Sir Thomas, 3 *n.*
Socialists, Christian, 351, 352.
Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 286.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 311.
Society of Jesus, 233.
Spain, Bramhall's journey to, 102.
Spencer, Herbert, 358.
Staël, Madame de, 286.
Stanley, Bishop of Sodor and Man, 6 *n.*
Steere, Edward, 314.
Stephen, Leslie, 240, 357 *n.*
Stephen's *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, 270, 274, 294.
Sterling, John, 330 f., 344.
Stillingfleet, 145, 153, 159, 248.
Stock's *History of the C.M.S.*, 276 *n.*
Stoke, deanery of, 8.
Stoughton's *Religion under the Georges*, 265 *n.*, 278 *n.*
Strafford, Earl of, made Lord Deputy, 72, 84; visits Usher at Drogheda, 73; coerces the Irish Convocation, 92; his government of Ireland, 86 f., 91, 99; intercedes for Bramhall, 101; his confession heard by Usher, 76; referred to, 82.
Strafford Letters, 81 *n.*, 85 *n.*, 86 *n.*, 87 *n.*, 91 *n.*, 92 *n.*, 98 *n.*, 99 *n.*, 101 *n.*
Strype's *Parker*, 5, 6 *n.*, 20.
Stubbs, Bishop, 318 *n.*
Sumner, Archbishop, 318.
— Bishop of Winchester, 302 *n.*, 319 *n.*, 322.
Sutton, Sir Robert, 223.
Swift, Dean, 150, 151, 153, 190, 302, 304.
Swinburne, A. C., 218.

Tait, Archbishop, 309 *n.*
Taunton, E. L., xii *n.*
Taylor, Jeremy, his early life, 123 f.; Chillingworth's influence on, 125; his early writings, 126; upholds the cause of the persecuted Church, 127; the *Ductor Dubitantium*, 130, 165; *Dissuasive from Popery*, 135; *Rules and Advices to the Clergy*, 136; death, 137; character, 138 f.; *Funeral Sermon* for Bramhall, 83 *n.*, 90 *n.*, 95 *n.*, 100 *n.*, 114, 119; referred to, 81, 105 *n.*, 117 *n.*, 248.
— Rowland, 123.
Teignmouth, Lord, 279.
Temple, Archbishop, 300.
Tertullian, 359 *n.*
Test Acts, 170, 187, 226.
Theological colleges, 311.
Thirlwall, Bishop, 139, 244.
Thomason, Thomas, 271, 275, 280.
Thorndike, 127.
Thornton, Henry, 274, 283.
Thurloe's *State Papers*, 101 *n.*, 102 *n.*
Thurlow, Bishop, 307 *n.*
Tillotson, Archbishop, 40, 150, 153, 159.
Times, the, 306, 309.
Toland, John, 245 *n.*
Toleration, Bramhall's view of, 117; Taylor's, 132, 134, 135; Burnet's, 169, 183 f., 187; Warburton's, 227 f., 234; Phillpotts's, 306.
Tract XC, 125, 315.
Tracts for Priests and People, 350.

Travers, Walter, 27, 29, 62, 67, 73, 86 *n.*
Trinity College, Dublin, 60, 62 f., 87 *n.*, 135.
Trollope, Anthony, his character-sketches, 299 f.
'Trulliber, Parson,' 310.
Truro, Phillpotts's share in founding the see of, 312.
Tulloch, Principal, 140.

Ulster, presbyterianism in, 73, 86.
Unitarianism, Maurice brought up in, 329; finds it fulfilled in the Christian faith, 336 f.
Universalism, Maurice has no sympathy with, 353, 354.
University Commission, the first, 309.
Usher, James, his early life, 60; Calvinistic opinions, 61; made Regius Professor, 63; engages in controversy, 63 f.; chronological studies, 65 f.; draws up the Articles of 1615, 67, 86; Bishop of Meath, 68; *Answer to a Jesuit*, 70; Archbishop of Armagh, 71; his chapel at Drogheda, 73; summoned to England, 74; Bishop of Carlisle, 75; his edition of Ignatius, 76; preacher of Lincoln's Inn, ib.; his friendship for Strafford, 100; Bramhall's famous letter to, 103 *n.*; his character, 59, 69, 77; Vesey on, 118 *n.*; Loftus on, ib.; referred to, 81, 87, 88 *n.*, 89 *n.*, 92, 93, 94 *n.*, 144.
Utrecht, treaty of, 187.

Vaughan, Richard, Earl of Carbery, 126.
Vaughan's *Life of Robinson*, 259, 275 *n.*, 283, 288.
Venn, Henry, 263 f., 266, 267, 283, 288.
— John, 265, 274, 283.
Vesey, Bishop, his *Athanasius Hibernicus*, 81 *n.*, 84 *n.*, 88 *n.*, 89 *n.*, 90, 91 *n.*, 93 *n.*, 95 *n.*, 97 *n.*, 98, 100 *n.*, 101 *n.*, 102 *n.*, 105 *n.*, 106, 107 *n.*, 109 *n.*, 112 *n.*, 113 *n.*, 114 *n.*, 116 *n.*, 117, 118.
Visitation of 1559, 6, 15, 16.
Voltaire, 221, 222, 250.

Waad, Armigail, 3 *n.*
Walker, Dr, 102 *n.*
Walpole, Horace, 218.
Walton's *Life of Hooker*, 25, 28.
Wandesford, Sir Christopher, 85 *n.*, 98 *n.*
Warburton, William, facts of his life, 223 f.; his general position, 216 f.; his character, 224 f., 244 f.; the *Alliance*, 223, 225–231; the *Divine Legation*, 223, 237–242; his theory of Church and State, 227 f.; no Erastian, 234; on Romanism, 234 f.; his strong points, 248 f.; on Taylor, 141; on Whitefield and Venn, 264.
Ward, Dr, 83.
Watson, Richard, 98 *n.*
— William, 14 *n.*
Wellington, Duke of, 301 *n.*, 307, 308 *n.*, 309.
Wesley, John, 137, 141, 198, 218, 224, 247, 257.
Westbury, Lord, 322.
Westcott, Brooke Foss, 335 *n.*
Westmeath, Countess of, 285.
Westminster Assembly, 74, 86 *n.*
Wharton, Henry, 175.
Whitaker, 98 *n.*
White, Henry Kirke, 284.
Whitefield, George, 257, 263, 264, 302.
Whitgift, Abp, 19 *n.*, 27, 28, 31.
Wilberforce, Robert Isaac, 320.
— Samuel, Bishop of Oxford, Trollope's character-sketch of, 299; champions Maurice, 352 *n.*, 355; referred to, 309, 321, 322.
— William, 274 f., 279, 283, 284.
Wilfrid, 323.
Wilkins, David, 92 *n.*, 93 *n.*, 159.
William III, receives Burnet, 179; invades England, 181 f.; 150, 187.
William IV, 291.
Williams, John, 81.
Wilson, Bishop, 31, 262.
Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 117 *n.*
Wright, W. B., 81 *n.*, 82 *n.*, 83 *n.*
Wyatt, William, 125.

Yorke, Bishop, 266.
Young, the poet, 220.

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Cancelled from
Gladstone's Library
27 NOV 2021
GLADSTONE'S
LIBRARY

Cancelled from
Gladstone's Library
27 NOV 2021
GLADSTONE'S
LIBRARY